



# RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

AND

## PROTECTION OF AMERICAN CITIZENS ABROAD.

GREAT PUBLIC MEETING AT THE TABERNACLE,

New-York, January 26th, 1854.

---

Supplement to the February Number of the American and Foreign Christian Union.

---

We issue a Supplement to the February number of our Magazine, in order to give an account of the proceedings of a meeting held on Thursday night, January 26th, in the Broadway Tabernacle, together with the Letters received from distinguished gentlemen who had been invited to attend, the Addresses delivered, &c. &c. We hope that those who receive this pamphlet will not only read it, but also circulate it among their friends. Still more; we would make the earnest request that they would, in conjunction with others—their neighbors and friends—forward, without delay, Memorials (a form of which will be found in the proceedings of the Meeting in question) to both Houses of Congress.

Although the weather was extremely unfavorable, a large number of citizens were present. There were also gentlemen present from Brooklyn, Williamsburg, Jersey City, Newark, and other places in the vicinity.

Mortimer De Motte, Esq. in behalf of the American and Foreign Christian Union, under whose auspices, and by whose efforts, the Meeting was convened, read the following Call, together with the names of the gentlemen subscribed.

### THE CALL.

The undersigned would respectfully invite their fellow-citizens to a Public Meeting, to be held in the Tabernacle on THURSDAY EVENING, the 26th instant, for the purpose of adopting such measures as may then be deemed proper to secure the influence of our National Government

in the promotion of the principles of Religious Freedom, and especially in the protection of American citizens in the enjoyment of their rights of conscience and of religious worship, and to bury their dead in such way, and with such rites, as to them may seem most appropriate, when sojourning or traveling in foreign lands.

The enjoyment of these rights is fully granted and completely guaranteed to people of all nations, who, on account of business or pleasure, visit our country, and the reciprocation of them on the part of others toward our citizens ought no longer to be withheld.

A. R. Wetmore,	T. Tileston,	Alexander Stuart,
William Colgate,	Peter Lorillard,	David Olyphant,
C. R. Robert,	William Douglass,	R. M. Olyphant,
Francis Hall,	William B. Crosby,	Wm. B. Astor,
James Harper,	Mortimer DeMotte,	Stewart Brown,
Peter Cooper,	Shepherd Knapp,	G. B. Lamar,
Horace Holden,	Benj. B. Sherman,	A. Norrie,
Thomas H. Faile,	Robert C. Goodhue,	Hiram Ketchum,
Stephen Whitney,	James Brown,	Moses Taylor,
James Donaldson,	A. P. Halsey,	C. V. S. Roosevelt,
Walter Lowrie,	Henry C. Bowen,	D. Leavitt,
Edmund Penfold,	G. Wood,	J. Oothout,
P. Perit,	Wm. E. Dodge,	J. Boorman,
R. W. Weston,	Anson G. Phelps,	Joseph Sampson,
John C. Green,	Gerard Hallock,	George Griswold, Jr.
James Lenox,	Robert L. Stuart,	

The Hon. George Wood was chosen President of the Meeting.

The following gentlemen were nominated as Vice-Presidents and Secretaries.

#### VICE-PRESIDENTS.

A. P. Halsey,	Hon. Theo. Frelinghuysen,	J. Donaldson,
James Brown,	Horace Holden,	Wm. Douglass,
Robert L. Stuart,	M. Van Schaick,	A. R. Wetmore,
Wm. Colgate,	Pelatiah Perit,	C. V. S. Roosevelt,
Peter Cooper,	C. R. Robert,	Wm. W. Stone,
James Boorman,	Joseph Sampson,	James Lennox,
Shepherd Knapp,	W. B. Astor,	Peter Lorillard,
Wm. B. Crosby,	George Douglass,	Gerard Hallock,
Thos. Tileston,	James Harper,	G. C. Verplanck,
Stephen Whitney,	Hon. Chief Justice Horn-	David Olyphant,
Wm. E. Dodge,	blower,	Thomas B. Stillman.

#### SECRETARIES.

M. De Motte,	Rev. Dr. Stevens,	Edward Vernon,
Prof. H. Crosby,	John W. Corson, M. D.	F. Frelinghuysen.

These nominations were unanimously confirmed.

Hon. George Wood, on assuming the Chair, spoke as follows:

*Fellow Citizens*—The objects of the meeting have already been sufficiently stated in the proposition of its Call, which has just been read to you. You will be addressed by a number of gentlemen who will speak upon the subjects appertaining to this important matter, in whose remarks they will be fully explained, and it will be unnecessary for me to delay you with any observations of mine. Perhaps, however, I may say with safety that if there be any people in the world who have a right to call for the exercise and indulgence of religious freedom in foreign lands, it is the people of the United States. You cannot walk in any of the public streets of this city without seeing the evidence of that liberality which we extend to nations abroad. Their people come here for the purposes of business or recreation, and for all of those objects which induce individuals from other countries to visit foreign lands. You hear almost all languages of Europe spoken in our streets, and they have full liberty to engage in all branches of commerce and the arts; and they have equally the privilege of worshipping their God according to the dictates of their own conscience, without any restriction whatever; and we think that the people of this country ought to receive similar privileges among those nations that derive these important benefits in our own country. We wish to bring this subject before the people at large, that they may memorialize Congress, that the subject may receive that attention from our Government which its importance deserves; and we trust that we have, at this time, arrived at that station of respectability and importance among the different nations of the earth, to entitle our Government, when they make a call of this kind upon the different nations of the earth, to have that call respected, and carried into effect. I have now stated the general purposes of this meeting, which will be opened with a prayer by Rev. Dr. Beecher, of the Baptist Church.

Rev. Dr. Beecher, of the Baptist Church, formerly of Albany, and now of New-York, opened the proceedings with prayer.

The Rev. Dr. Baird, one of the Secretaries of the American and Foreign Christian Union, then read the following Statement of Facts, which sets forth the reasons for calling the meeting.

### THE STATEMENT.

It will be expected that the reasons for calling this meeting should be set forth at the outset. This expectation is both legitimate and proper. We shall endeavor to satisfy it by presenting a very simple and brief statement.

The vast expansion of the commerce of our country, and the great aug-

mentation of the facilities of travel, have combined within the last few years to induce many of our fellow-citizens to go abroad for business or for pleasure; and every successive year in increasing numbers. It will not be going too far to affirm that many thousands of Americans are to be found every year residing or traveling in foreign lands.

In some of these countries there are very great obstacles in the way of their enjoying the rights of Conscience and Religious worship. In some, they cannot enjoy those rights at all. In some countries they are exposed to insult and injury if they do not comply with observances in the streets that are repugnant to their conscientious convictions. And in some they find it almost, if not quite, impossible to have their dead buried with such rites as they deem most Christian and most consonant with their feelings.

The limits of this document will not allow much detail; nevertheless, we must submit a few facts.

I. In our immediate vicinity lies the Island of Cuba, in whose ports hundreds and thousands of American mariners are annually to be seen, and to whose Cities and Plantations hundreds of our merchants and invalid citizens annually resort, in the prosecution of business or in quest of health. Many go thither to die! And yet, to this day, there is neither an American Protestant Chapel nor Chaplain for the spiritual instruction and care of our seamen and others of our countrymen, or for their guidance and consolation in the most fearful of all hours—the hour of death!—far from their homes and their friends! When the attempt was made a few years ago by the American Seamen's Friend Society to have Protestant religious services conducted aboard American ships at Havana, the Chaplain was compelled to desist, because it was not only required that he should "domiciliate" and take the oath of allegiance to the Queen of Spain, but also that he should swear that he was a good "Catholic." As these words signify a "Roman Catholic" in that land, no conscientious Protestant could or would take the oath. The same statement holds good of Porto Rico, the other principal Spanish island in the West Indies.

There is no American Protestant Chapel or service in Mexico, so far as we can learn, and it is believed that it would be difficult, if not impossible, to establish one. In some countries in South America, as well as in Central America, there would be difficulties to encounter; yet they would be far less formidable, it is believed, than in Mexico and Cuba.

In Italy itself, the central country of Christendom, with the exception of the kingdom of Sardinia, no religious service could be held by an American Protestant minister for the benefit of his countrymen, unless in the house of a diplomatic or consular agent, beneath the American flag, and as it were on American ground. This is so even in Rome, the Capital of the Christian World, as some vauntingly claim. Although the Roman Catholic Church



is permitted to enjoy in these United States, (seven-eighths at least of whose inhabitants are Protestants,) all the rights and privileges that any Protestant Church does, yet American Protestants are denied the right to have a church in Rome, or even a chapel, unless under the precarious condition of enjoying the patronage of, and in connection with, the American Embassy.

Nor is the state of things in Spain or in Austria more favorable than in Italy; in fact it is less so. Whilst in Portugal, according to the new Penal Code, promulgated on the 10th of December, 1852, the "celebrating of public acts of worship not that of the Catholic religion" is punishable with imprisonment of from one to three years, and to a fine proportioned to the income of the transgressor of the law! It is obvious that a Protestant church or chapel, even for foreigners, could not be opened in the Portuguese dominions since this law went into effect, without incurring the most serious risk. And all this is done in the middle of the XIXth century, and by a nation which owes its very existence at this day to Protestant England!

II. American Protestants are exposed to insult and serious mal-treatment in Mexico, Central America, all South America, Cuba, Porto Rico, Spain and Portugal, nearly all of Italy and Austria, if when they meet a procession, with a priest at its head, carrying the "Host," they do not render what are there considered to be acts of adoration, but which they conscientiously deem to be idolatrous and contrary to the Word of God. Every year the truth of this assertion is confirmed by disgraceful outrages, in word or deed, perpetrated in those countries.

III. As to the burial of their dead, American Protestants find very serious difficulties in several of the countries just named. Until very recently—nor are we sure that it is not so still—they would have been compelled to carry the bodies of their deceased friends from Madrid, the capital of Spain, to Malaga, Gibraltar, or Lisbon, to find a burial for them. English Protestants were subject to the same shameful indignities. Even within the last few months, Lord Howden, the British Ambassador at the Court of Spain, has been in earnest correspondence with the Spanish Government, in relation to the right of English Protestants, not merely to have at Madrid a cemetery, (which at length they are permitted to possess,) but also to have the bodies of their deceased friends carried to the grave in a hearse, and proper religious ceremonies performed in the cemetery, at the interment. There is a report that he has succeeded, but we are not sure of it.

In many places in Italy, American Protestants are subject to much inconvenience in being required to bury their dead at very unseasonable hours. In some countries, through fear of violence, they are compelled to bury their dead in a stealthy manner, and almost as uncereemoniously as they would a brute beast.

A few years ago, a highly respectable American merchant (of a neighboring city) was compelled to dig a grave with his own hands, in an obscure spot, near one of the cities of Cuba, at the hour of midnight, for the burial of his beloved wife, whom he had taken to that island for the restoration of her health. By the influence of much persuasion, he succeeded in getting some assistance in his mournful enterprise from one or two negroes, who were in great fear, all the while, for their lives, lest it should become known that they had assisted at the burial of a heretic!

On all these subjects, we hold it to be the duty of the American government to negotiate for, and secure by treaty, the rights of all its citizens, whether of native or foreign origin, in all countries where these rights are not fully recognized. This duty has been acknowledged, and to some degree fulfilled, by our Government from its commencement. As early as 1783, the religious rights of American citizens were guaranteed by Sweden, in a treaty made that year with the Government of the United States. From time to time—under the administrations of Washington, Jefferson, and their successors—something was done in regard to other countries. We are happy to say that at present we are not aware that there is a Protestant country where an American citizen, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, is not permitted to enjoy his rights in relation to the subjects which have been specified. During the last administration, more was done than in any preceding one, with, perhaps, the exception of those of the second Adams and General Jackson, in this respect; for negotiations were instituted by it with some of the governments of South America, (particularly the Oriental Republic of Uruguay and the Argentine Confederation,) which terminated favorably.

To encourage and sustain the Government in the farther prosecution of this great work, is one of the objects of this meeting.

Why should not the Government protect our citizens when abroad in the enjoyment of their religious as well as their civil and political rights? Are the latter more important than the former? Or is not the converse of this proposition true? We thank God that the day has come when we may say, almost in the noble language of the President in his Inaugural, that no American citizen can wander to any point on the globe where the strong arm of the Government shall not be stretched out to protect him. It is time that this shall be as true of his religious as of his political interests.

We hold, too, that the man who goes to distant lands to spread abroad the knowledge of the Gospel—whether by the distribution of the Sacred Scriptures and other religious books, or by proclaiming the way of salvation *viva voce*—must not be considered as having expatriated himself, or put himself beyond the pale of the protecting care of the Government, any more than the merchant who goes abroad for his business, but is to be protected in his work by the powerful arm of the State, so long as he does nothing con-

trary to the laws of the countries to which he goes. Thus far we may go with confidence. Nothing short of this—no opposition or violence, created by unrelenting Bigotry or blind Prejudice—should be allowed to drive an American Christian missionary from his field.

This was the ground that was taken by Mr. Webster in 1841 (when Secretary of State under Mr. Tyler's administration) in his letter to Commodore Porter, (then the American Chargé d'Affaires at Constantinople,) respecting the American missionaries laboring in Turkey. This ground, if we mistake not, the overwhelming majority of this nation are prepared to take and defend. The spirit of nationality which would not allow a hair of the head of Martin Kostza to be touched, simply because he had taken measures to become an American citizen, and had put himself under the care of the Government, and was doing nothing contrary to the laws of Turkey, will not long allow an American Christian Missionary to suffer in a foreign land, or be ignobly thrust out of it, so long as he does nothing contrary to the laws of that country.

Nor can we forbear to say that we think that the time has come when the Governments of these United States and Great Britain, and all other Christian nations which enjoy the blessings of religious liberty, and know its inestimable advantages, should combine their efforts for the purpose of hastening its universal prevalence in the world. It is certainly not less a legitimate subject for solemn negotiation and the formal stipulations of international treaty than many subjects that concern humanity for which such interference has been secured.\* It can be shown that intolerance on the subject of religion has been the cause of the most bitter animosities, the most unnatural separations, and many of the bloodiest and longest-continued wars of which the world has ever been the theatre. It has often arrayed against each other, in the most cruel strife, those who profess the same religious belief, but differ in regard to unimportant-shades of opinion in doctrine or modes of worship. What deplorable conflicts have taken place between Protestant and Roman Catholic nations, and between Roman Catholics and the Greek and other Oriental Christians! Even within the very walls of the church at Jerusalem, which incloses the reputed sepulchre of our Lord, they have fought in the most barbarous manner, and that in the presence of their common enemy, the Mussulman! It is time that this disgrace should be removed forever from the escutcheon of Christendom. The Christian nations owe it to Him whose sacred name they

\* The African Slave Trade and Piracy are scarcely more important subjects for such negotiation. Nor have instances been wanting of the interference to which we have referred in the text. Had it not been for the efforts and earnest remonstrances of England (during the Protectorate of Cromwell, the reigns of William and Mary, and Queen Anne,) and those of Holland, Sweden and the Protestant Cantons of Switzerland in the 17th and 18th centuries, the Waldenses would have been annihilated.

bear, (and whose religion, as preached by Himself, is so well calculated, as it was unquestionably designed, to promote "peace on earth and good will among men,") to cause it to be removed.

In vain do men search for one sentence in all His discourses or precepts to justify either persecution or intolerance in matters of religion. And it can be demonstrated that the manifestation of the spirit of forbearance and tolerance where diversity of religious belief exists, is as conducive to the welfare of communities and even of nations, as it is of individuals. And it is the duty of Governments—especially Christian Governments—to cause such forbearance and tolerance,—in other and better words, *religious liberty*,—to be maintained and respected. It would seem as if the day ought by this time to have arrived when no man shall suffer death, or be in any way oppressed or interfered with, in regard to his religious convictions, and the proper manifestation of them.

We are happy to believe that the views which we have expressed have often been shared by the distinguished men to whose hands the administration of our government has from time to time been delegated. In the year 1825, the Governments of Mexico, Central America, and Colombia resolved to hold a Congress at the Isthmus of Panama, at which each of them should be represented, "to deliberate upon objects important to the welfare of all." \* Our Government was invited to send representatives to that Congress. The distinguished man who then occupied the Presidential chair (the late John Quincy Adams) accepted the invitation, and nominated for that mission two distinguished citizens, one of whom was the late Hon. John Sergeant, of Philadelphia. It is known that one great object which the President had much at heart, in relation to that Congress, was to endeavor to induce the South American Republics to come to right ground in regard to the principles of religious liberty—believing it to be essential to their true prosperity and happiness. It is believed that Mr. Adams lost no suitable opportunity, during his administration, of kindly calling the attention of these Governments to this great subject. His sentiments on the importance of religious liberty were fully shared by two illustrious citizens, now no more—Dewitt Clinton and Henry Clay—both ardent friends of the South American Republics.

Our Government seconded the efforts of England to persuade the Porte to grant religious liberty, or a large measure of it, to its Christian subjects. Why should not the same thing be done in the case of some governments which are called Christian—some of them Roman Catholic, some Protestant, and one of them of the Greek Church—but whose intolerance is a dishonor to the name of Christ? At all events, let our Government ever be ready,

\* First Annual Message of John Quincy Adams.



by kind negotiation—by unofficial exertion, if nothing more can be done—to lend the weight of its moral influence, whenever it is needed, to the promotion of this great interest. Our Government grants religious liberty to all who come to this happy land. It has a right to expect to be heard when it approaches other nations on this subject, and respectfully urges them to try what we have found to be so great a blessing.

Facts are not wanting to prove that such an intervention is not likely to be made in vain. A short letter from Mr. Webster, (when Secretary of State, under Mr. Tyler's administration,) to a Consular Agent in the East exerted a happy influence on the Pacha of Damascus, who had allowed the Jews of that city to suffer an almost exterminating persecution. A brief inquiry, certainly not containing five sentences, addressed by Mr. Forsyth, (Secretary of State during Mr. Van Buren's administration,) to the American Consul at Hamburg, produced an excellent effect upon the Senate of that city, in relation to the persecution which the Baptists were there enduring. A letter from Mr. Barnard to the Government of Prussia, some eighteen months ago, had a happy effect in the case of the Rev. Mr. Oneken and the Baptist brethren in that kingdom. Nor can we doubt that the letter of Mr. Everett, a year ago, (whilst Secretary of State, during Mr. Fillmore's administration,) to the Grand Duke of Tuscany, had some influence on the case of the Madiai.

Such an influence we would see our Government ready to exert, whenever there is need of it,—in Protestant countries in favor of persecuted or oppressed Roman Catholics, just as promptly and as earnestly as in Roman Catholic countries in favor of persecuted or oppressed Protestants; and in both Protestant and Roman Catholic countries, when there is need, in behalf of the injured and oppressed Israelite.

Such are some of the considerations which have led to the calling of this meeting. The Board of Directors of the American and Foreign Christian Union—a Society which embraces good men of almost every branch of the Protestant Church in our country—have felt it to be their duty, inasmuch as the promotion of religious liberty is one of the great objects for which it was organized, to invite their fellow citizens to unite with them in an attempt to call the attention of the Public and of the Government to this great subject. Nor can they believe that (with the blessing of Heaven) it will be in vain.

---

## LETTERS IN REPLY TO INVITATIONS.

The Rev. Dr. Fairchild, the other Corresponding Secretary of the American and Foreign Christian Union, next stated that interesting and important letters had been received from several distinguished

gentlemen who had been invited to attend the meeting, among whom he named the Honorable Messrs. Everett, Lawrence, Barnard, Wise, Schenck, McCurdy, Winthrop, and Jessup, of whom the first six have represented this Government at the Courts of Great Britain, Prussia, Brazil, and Austria. He also stated that the Rev. Dr. Durbin, who had been expected to address the meeting, was detained in Philadelphia by his official labors. Extracts from some of these letters were read by Dr. Fairchild. We here give several of them entire, and venture to express the desire that they may be read with attention; for they serve well to present in a striking light the importance of the object for whose promotion the meeting was called.

---

Letter from Rev. Dr. Durbin.

Philadelphia, Tuesday, January 24th, 1854.

Rev. Dr. BAIRD.

MY DEAR SIR.—It is now settled that I cannot be in New-York next Thursday evening, and of course cannot take part in your public meeting. I sincerely wish I could be there, and have the privilege of saying a few words in favor of religious liberty in all countries, and more particularly in favor of our own citizens enjoying, when residing or traveling in Papal countries, the religious liberty which our own country grants to the citizens or natives of other countries residing among us. For several years I have publicly, in the pulpit and by the press, advocated the propriety of taking measures, both as citizens and as a Government, to obtain religious liberty for our citizens from those Governments within whose limits they may reside or travel with the consent of said Government. I have ever thought that when a Government admits a person within its limits, it by that very act grants him the due exercise of his inalienable rights, and certainly among these are the rights of conscience in religious matters. I am satisfied that our Government ought to use all its legitimate influence to obtain these privileges for our citizens, and to have respect to this in all treaties to be made hereafter. There is good reason to believe, that if there was a general expression on the part of the people of this country in favor of the measure proposed, our Government would not only give attention to the matter, but would strenuously urge it on all suitable occasions, and with success.

I am, yours very respectfully,

J. P. DURBIN.

## Letter from Hon. Abbott Lawrence.

Boston, Monday, January 9th, 1854.

DEAR SIRs.—I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your note of invitation, to be present at a meeting of the members of the Society of the "American and Foreign Christian Union," on the 26th inst. for the purpose of calling the attention of the people, and especially the Government of the United States, to the serious disabilities under which Americans labor in some foreign countries, in consequence of not being allowed to worship God as Protestants, in accordance with the dictates of their consciences and their own views of duty. Besides, there are countries in Europe where it is found difficult, and in some cases almost impossible, for Protestants to bury their dead with those rites which are most in harmony with their convictions of Christian duty. It has appeared to me for several years past, that these two points were proper subjects for Executive consideration and diplomatic action.

The time has now arrived, in the middle of this Nineteenth Century, when such stains, which have been so long lamented as discreditable to the character of those countries, should be removed.

I cannot doubt that our Government will, without hesitation, give this subject the consideration which its importance demands; and that instructions will be transmitted to our Representatives abroad, of a character that will accomplish the object our citizens have so long desired. It may not be obtained at once; but the spirit of the age in which we live, it seems to me, must have the effect of producing changes in the civil and religious condition of several countries in Europe, which are now suffering under a spiritual and political despotism, so that one would suppose (even in the absence of the Bible) it cannot long survive the introduction of those lower but powerful agencies of the printing press, steam engine, and telegraph, coupled with the great and constantly augmenting intercourse of the nations of the earth.

I fully sympathize in the objects of your proposed meeting, and regret that it will not be in my power to unite personally in carrying forward the truly Christian purposes indicated in your note.

I have the honor to be, dear Sirs, very sincerely, your obedient servant.

ABBOTT LAWRENCE.

To Anson G. Phelps, John W. Corson, Mortimer De Motte, and  
William W. Stone, Esq. *Committee.*  
Rev. R. Baird, D. D. and Rev. E. R. Fairchild, D. D. *Secretaries.*

## Letter from Hon. Edward Everett.

WASHINGTON, Friday, January 6th, 1854.

GENTLEMEN.—Your favor of the 29th of December reached me to-day. I regret that my engagements here will put it out of my power to attend the meeting in the Tabernacle on the 26th inst.

I concur with you in the opinion that it is the duty of the Executive Government, in its negotiations with foreign powers, to procure as far as possible for the citizens of the United States, traveling or residing abroad, liberty of conscience and freedom of religious worship. The customary law of nations secures these rights, to a certain extent, to a Minister Resident and his suite; and provision has been made by treaty in many cases to extend the same rights to his countrymen. There is room for great improvement in this respect, and the increasing enlightenment of the age demands it. The United States, of all the powers of Christendom, ought to expect the most liberal treatment in this respect, in return for the religious equality guaranteed by the Constitution.

The right of Christian burial ought in all cases to be freely conceded. Common humanity requires this.

This subject has long since engaged the attention of the Government. A liberal provision for freedom of conscience and Christian burial was secured by our treaty with Sweden as early as 1783, and similar stipulations are contained in more recent treaties, particularly those with the Catholic States of South America. In 1826 Mr. ADAMS mentioned "just and liberal principles of religious liberty" as one of the objects to be promoted by the Congress at Panama.

I am happy to learn from you that the President and Secretary of State are believed to be favorable to the general object in view. Their influence, steadily and prudently exerted, will contribute materially to the desired end.

It must not be forgotten, however, that there is no subject on which Foreign States are more jealous than their religious belief and the rites and usages connected with it; and also that the discretionary power of all branches of our own Government is extremely limited in all that pertains to this subject.

I remain, gentlemen, with great respect, yours, very truly,

EDWARD EVERETT.

Messrs. Anson G. Phelps, W. W. Stone, Mortimer De Motte, J. W. Corson, Committee.  
Drs. R. Baird, and E. R. Fairchild, Corresponding Secretaries.

---

 Letter from D. D. Barnard.

Albany, Tuesday Jan. 24, 1854.

GENTLEMEN.—I appreciate highly the honor you have done me in your urgent appeal to me to be present and take part in the meeting proposed



to be held at the Tabernacle, in New-York, on the 26th inst. by the American and Foreign Christian Union.

I regret to say that my engagements do not allow me to hope to be able to attend this meeting. I cannot, however, suffer the occasion to pass without declaring my hearty concurrence and sympathy with the views and objects of your Society in the proposed meeting, as they are explained to me in your letter.

To secure to American citizens traveling or residing abroad the right of Conscience and of Religious Worship, as a special object; and, as a broader and more general object, to promote the great principle of Religious Toleration and Freedom in those countries where it does not now exist, and with which we maintain Diplomatic relations—these are objects worthy, certainly, of grave consideration, and, I think, of earnest effort.

If the great principle of Religious Toleration can be secured, the whole object would be essentially gained. And, on the other hand, if American citizens can have the privilege of free worship, the performance of their own religious rites, and immunity from observances contrary to their consciences, accorded to them, general religious toleration could not long be withheld.

The Government of the United States may very properly interpose, in the way of diplomatic representations, for protection of American citizens abroad, in the quiet performance of their own religious worship and ceremonies, as well on ordinary occasions as in particular circumstances—for example, the burial of their dead.

When the question is one which concerns religious toleration in general, having no special regard to any complaints or any claims on the part of American citizens, then the matter would assume rather the form of intervention; but it would be an intervention justified by every just consideration of Christian principle and charity, and one easily divested of every offensive or objectionable feature, by observing a becoming modesty and deference in presenting it, and employing no other arguments or means than such as the great law of love and brotherhood, and the rules of good sense and of common courtesy and mutual respect between equal and friendly Powers would sanction.

I am persuaded that much might be effected with Governments abroad on this whole subject, with a proper demeanor on our part, and a proper use of the right means. We must not assume too much, nor demand too much, nor be too impatient at delays. Governments abroad are often much in advance of their people, in point both of intelligence and liberality on subjects of this character. They cannot always do what they would like to do. And sometimes, unhappily, our citizens abroad add to the embarrassments of the Governments in regard to measures of relief or reform, by unreflecting, injudicious, or fanatical proceedings or demonstrations in the

face of the public, unnecessarily shocking incurable prejudices, and rousing and inflaming popular hate and passion.

My confidence in the reasonable success of judicious and becoming measures and efforts for religious toleration in countries where it is now unknown, or nearly so, is based on personal observation abroad, and, in some degree, on personal experience. I had occasion, during my late residence abroad, to try the experiment, in an humble way, of a direct appeal to the sovereign of the country where I resided, in behalf of a portion of his own subjects, for protection against religious persecution. It is true, this was in a Protestant country, and the appeal was made to a Protestant and truly Christian King; but the intolerance complained of proceeded from the Established Church of the kingdom, of which the King was the recognized head, and which stood upon the laws of the kingdom as the ground and justification of its persecuting spirit. The kind manner in which this appeal was received, and the result have convinced me that efforts of the sort, made in the right temper, may be productive of much good. Even in countries where another and very jealous faith prevails, appeals, made in the spirit of a catholic charity, from this Protestant country, which aims to give an example of perfect toleration and complete protection to all religions, would not, I am confident, be altogether in vain.

I think, also, that the time is propitious. England has already done a great deal towards opening the way for a more enlightened and more tolerant sentiment and feeling on all this subject. The English Church has made a lodgment in almost every quarter of the European Continent. Everywhere it is a foreign establishment, maintained and supported as such, but is covered by the toleration and protection of the Governments where it is planted. And whether in Romish or Protestant countries—for both have been intolerant in their laws and in their prejudices and practices—the presence of the English Church, always orderly and inoffensive, by gradually accustoming the people and governments to a worship and service differing from the established forms, has tended to disarm prejudice and to give the impression that general toleration might be indulged both with propriety and safety.

It cannot be doubted, I think, that Europe has been and is making rapid progress in liberal and tolerant ideas, from whatever cause it may proceed. No observant person who may have visited Europe twenty years ago could visit it now without noticing the difference. And I think the time has fully come when the strongest encouragement is given to hope for signal success in such efforts as the Directors of the American and Foreign Christian Union now propose shall be made through the instrumentality and authority of the American Government, in connection perhaps with the English, and it may

be with other Governments, for promoting the triumph of the great cause of religious liberty in Europe.

I am, gentlemen, with high consideration and respect, your obedient servant,

D. D. BARNARD.

Messrs. Anson G. Phelps, W. W. Stone, John W. Corson, E. R. Fairchild, R. Baird.

---

Letter from Hon. Robert C. Winthrop.

Boston, Monday Jan. 23, 1854.

GENTLEMEN,—I am highly honored by your communication in behalf of the American and Foreign Christian Union, inviting me to address the meeting to be held at New-York, on the 26th inst. on the subject of *Religious Liberty*.

My engagements at home will not allow me to be present on the occasion; nor have I found opportunity for such an investigation of the particular topics suggested by you, as would enable me to furnish you, agreeably to your polite request, with any extended views on the subject.

Undoubtedly, grievances exist of a grave character, and which deserve the attention of our Government.

American citizens in foreign countries ought to be secure from any requisition to violate their conscientious convictions. They ought to be free to Worship God according to their own religious forms. And, certainly, they ought to be allowed to bury their dead with rites agreeable to their own feelings, and in places fit for such a purpose.

I sincerely trust, gentlemen, that your proceedings may be calculated to promote the accomplishment of these objects; and let me add my earnest hope, that the day may be hastened, when a true Religious Liberty may be enjoyed and secured, both at home and abroad, and when neither native nor foreigner, Protestant nor Catholic, upon our own soil or upon any other, shall be molested for his religious sentiments, or obstructed in his religious pursuits.

I am, with great respect and regard, your obliged and obedient servant,

ROBERT C. WINTHROP.

Messrs. Anson G. Phelps, John W. Corson, Mortimer De Motte, and William W. Stone, Committee.

Rev. Drs. Baird and E. R. Fairchild, Secretaries.

---

From Hon. Henry A. Wise.

Only, near Onancock, Va. Saturday, Jan. 14, 1854.

GENTLEMEN,—Yours of the 27th ult. reached me here yesterday, *via* Richmond. It was forwarded thence by a friend, and this must account for

the delay in its reception. I regret very much that I cannot accept your very inviting call to attend the meeting which you propose to hold, the 26th inst. at the Broadway Tabernacle, in New-York, to bring properly before our Government the subject of securing, "by treaty, for our people when traveling or residing abroad, the unmolested enjoyment of their rights of conscience;—the right to have their own public worship where they desire it; and to bury their dead with such religious services and rites as they may desire," &c. And in addition to this, you say: "It is believed that it would be well to use the occasion to suggest the inquiry, whether the time has not come for the Government of the United States to lend at least the weight of its moral influence in behalf of religious liberty, in all countries where it does not exist, and with which the United States have diplomatic relations," &c. On these great subjects you invite me to go and speak at the proposed meeting, and, if I cannot comply with this request, you ask that "I will give you, by letter, my views on the subjects for the promotion of which the meeting is to be called, that you may avail yourselves of them at the meeting, and afterwards through the press." And you make this appeal to me because you suppose "the subject is not new to me"—that in the diplomatic post which I have occupied at the Court of Brazil "I must have had my attention often called to it."

This subject is *not* new to me, and none of the public questions, of present moment, are of more importance and of more interest than this, in my humble opinion. The individual instances which could be cited in connection with it, would appear, perhaps, to be personal and minor matters as compared with others of great public concern; but a full consideration of this subject opens a universal field of world reform, as large, I venture to say, as any other which could be named. Indeed, practical success, in this moral and political enterprise, will at once reach many of the best results aimed at by the missionary of the Cross of Christ, by the men of science and discoverers of the earth, and by the arts and aims of life.

At a time like this, too, when the Bible's rays, and the students' lamps, and the ships' binnacles are illuminating and pointing the ways of knowledge, and lightning and steam are propelling progress everywhere, and in an age when there is *gold, gold, gold* enough and to spare to pay every laborer his hire in every good work of "good will to men," and when "peace on earth" has become the policy of every civilized nation; it is not to be tolerated that ignorance, and bigotry, and superstition, and barbarity and brute force, here, there, and almost everywhere, in some of the very fairest fields of human exertion, where much of man's highest excellence could be most easily attained, should be allowed, like serpents in Paradise, to corrupt our nature, shut out the light, hinder the progress of civilization, and arrest every step of humanity towards either mental, moral, or physical improve-



ment. We may surely arm ourselves *in the armor of righteousness* against such evil ones on earth as these.

Your own allusions, gentlemen, must be blamed, if I indulge in any egotism, by saying that when I entered upon the duties of the Mission to the Court of Brazil, I found the labors of one of my predecessors especially illustrated by the archives of the Legation. He was dead, but the good which he did was not all "interred with his bones." I was made by his works in that Mission to inquire feelingly for the remains of the laborious, the learned, the successful negotiator, Mr. Tudor. He died in Rio de Janeiro whilst Chargé of the United States of North America, the greatest Republic in the world, at the Court of Don Pedro I., and after he had negotiated our treaty of amity and commerce with that Empire. *The only sanctuary his corpse had found was a hospitable grave in the burying-ground which Great Britain had secured safe for heretics, her subjects, in a land broad enough surely for men of all persuasions to die in!* The Sabbath came, and I heard the bells chiming for church. Where were I and my family and American friends to attend Divine worship? *There was no ground consecrated there for us.* We were reminded on the Lord's day of our homes in our own blessed, happy land of universal tolerance in religion; but there, in a land of *commercial* friends by treaty, we had no *religious allies*, and were indeed "strangers in a strange land,"—*their God was our God, but their country was not our country to worship in.* We were compelled to go to our closets to pray, if we did not accept the hospitality again of English subjects, to kneel with them in their temple which their maternal Government had caused to be erected for their special privilege. Thus for the grave and the altar we were indebted to our mother country, and not to our own.

And here I cannot forbear to pay a just tribute to Great Britain for her care of her subjects abroad. However high her hand against other nations, however strong and unyielding her grasp of dominion over other people, she careth for *her own* at home, and to "the uttermost parts of the earth." Her "drum-beat" is heard everywhere, and wherever it is heard it is a sound of *protection to her little ones*—however feeble and however distant they may be from her central power. It is better for the barbarians of any tribe that a millstone were hung about their necks than for them to hurt one of Great Britain's protégés. They are heretics, as well as we; and they have their sanctuary and their grave-yards where the hyenas dare not howl. And it is due alike to her subjects to say that, in Brazil, they were hospitable to us, and gave us the use of both their holy places—the temple and the burying-ground. But ought we to have been beholden to any Government but our own for common rights of humanity like these?

I mean not to boast, but the Department of State can show how, when the American ships engaged in the charters of the infamous Slave trade dis-

charged their American crews, or drove them from shipboard by the worst of mal-usage, in order to avoid their being the witnesses of the traffic, and left them friendless and penniless all along the coast of South America, to encounter every brutality to which a forlorn sailor is subject in foreign ports; how when a Frothingham, of Boston, was knocked down in the streets of Rio de Janeiro, or a Southworth, of New-York, was imprisoned, or Clark, a sailor of New-York, was beaten; I never failed to interpose in any and every way to make our citizens abroad, assured that they had a protecting power over them, and to make foreign governments feel that we, too, as well as Great Britain, *took care of our own*. Great Britain not only supplied her Minister and Consul and men-of-war with the means of relief and the power of protection, but I may say here that I, as Minister of the United States, was more than once allowed the use of the British Consular seal, in affording personal protection to our citizens. And, finally, when for attempting to protect a poor seaman of our naval service, Mr. Davis, of Delaware, a Lieutenant of the Navy, was forcibly seized and imprisoned in the City Palace at Rio de Janeiro, I demanded his instant release; and here I may say, too, that in that demand I was supported firmly by as brave a squadron of our Navy, though small, as ever Hull or Decatur or Perry commanded. In one difficulty, the lamented Captain Turner, and in the last Captain Rousseau, were ready to stand by their flag and their Minister as long as there was "a shot in the locker." This is worthy to be mentioned to their honor, at a time when our popular sympathies are heartily offering medals to the gallant Ingraham for his timely interposition of late in favor of American protection in the Old World. At the time alluded to, we had in the harbor of Rio the frigate *Columbia*, and the little brig *Bainbridge*, and previously the frigate *Raritan*, and the same brig. On one occasion, when the Minister of Justice, Senr. Galvon, had sent a number of armed open boats, without notice to me or his own Minister of Foreign Affairs, that he was about to attempt by force what ought to have been accomplished by negotiation, I was appealed to by the Minister of Foreign Affairs to yield a question of extradition. I replied that I could do nothing *per minas*,—I would be silent as long as the arm of force was uplifted. "What will you do, sir?" said he. "Wait for your movements, sir!" was my reply. "Would you resist in our own harbor?" "You must risk the Paixhan shot of that, sir!" said I. He entreated then that I would go with him to see Senr. Galvon, the Minister of Justice. I replied, "I am accredited to your Emperor, sir." But he prevailed on me to accompany him, *as a friend*, to the house of his colleague in the Ministry. There I soon had occasion to say to the Minister of Justice, that I could not discuss the question with him. "Sir," said he, "suppose I had two frigates instead of one,—would your Commodore then presume to disregard the Imperial decrees?" "Sir," said I, "you have one frigate, two sloops-of-war, and a brig

in your harbor, and you have the forts Santa Cruz, Larges, Villagenon, and Isla Cobras, and one hundred water line guns,—is not that force enough against one frigate and one small brig?" "Sir," said he, "will your Commodore obey a writ of *habeas corpus*?" "Are you, sir," said I, "the Minister of Public Justice, and ask that question? Don't you know that the deck of a man-of-war of the United States is as the *terra firma* of my country, and that your process of law cannot go into that jurisdiction?" "Sir," said he, "if I could I would send a writ of *habeas corpus* to Heaven!" I told him that "I wished he could, and I would be an humble petitioner to be his Sheriff, Marshal, or Messenger to take his writ there; and I assured him that in case I did so, it would be the same with me as it would be with his messenger sent to our Commodore—*I would never come back to him!*" With that reply he was put into the best of humors—his sides shook with laughter "like a bowl full of jelly;" he rang his bell, ordered some *doces* (sweetmeats) and wine, and wound up by saying—"Well, sir, we will peaceably settle this affair, as I see that force will not do." "You can't negotiate with me sir, until you withdraw your armed forces," I replied; and that he ordered immediately. I then said to him that it was well affairs were about to take a peaceable turn; that our citizens had individually suffered the most odious oppressions, and they could be submitted to no longer; that my own son, (now Secretary of Legation at Berlin,) had just been wantonly assaulted in the streets and wounded on the head and the arms, simply for being a foreigner, and the child was present to exhibit the wounds; that had force been resorted to by him, the reprisals would have been severe. He immediately called in an officer of their *Permanentes*—their armed police—and asked me to let him have the person of my son at his command for a few hours. I consented at once, though the youth was then only about fifteen years of age. He was caused alone to walk, pass and repass alone for some hours about the place where he had been assaulted, while the *Permanentes* kept guard in the back-ground, ready to arrest the person who would probably assail again. The ruse failed, but I inquired of the Minister what would have been done with the culprit had he been arrested? "He would, sir, have been punished to your satisfaction—even unto death, had you required it." I replied that I was happy, then, the criminal had escaped detection. But from that moment a new era commenced in Rio de Janeiro of safety to American citizens. I may proudly say, and appeal to all who are informed on the subject, that American protection has been worth more in the three millions of square miles of that part of the globe than it was ever worth before. I threw the American flag over every person and every right that I could possibly or reasonably make it cover. It grew broader and broader in its folds, to my mind, every day that I studied more and more the laws of nations and rights of humanity. I made it the badge of my equipage, of



my family, and my only coat of arms; and our own rights and our own persons were made sacred under its protection. When Stephenson's regiment arrived from the United States for California, Sergeant Harris and his wife, an Irish woman, came in one of the transports, and had a female child born on the high seas. The officers of the *Preble* presented the babe with a silver eup, and christened the child Alta California Harris. They applied to me, the Minister of the United States, to stand godfather for that child at its christening. It was at a time when the Empress was just delivered of a young Princess, and the city had been illuminated, and every foreign man-of-war, except the *Columbia* and *Bainbridge*, had saluted the event. They declined to salute and I to illuminate, because Mr. Davis had been imprisoned. But when it was proposed to christen *one of our children*, to salute her with a national greeting, and I was asked to stand father to this American soldier's child, born in the service of his country, I leaped to the ceremony as no plaything, as nothing idle and unmeaning and childish, but as to the prompting of a passion—as to a patriotic duty full of example—that *we would take care of the least of our little ones too, all over the earth, and on the high seas!* I did take the vows before our Chaplain on the deck of the *Columbia*, and such guns and such cheers were hardly ever heard to “rattle among the crags” of the Corcovado and the Tejuea and the Pan de Assuear before! The meaning of it was: “*The United States will protect her citizens in their lawful rights the world over, and they shall have all the rights of the most favored sons of men?*”

I will, indeed, say here what I have never said publicly before; that if Lieutenant Davis had not been released, I would have demanded that Commodore Rousseau should have released him by force. His officers and crew were as patriotic and devoted as Deatur's at Tripoli. Had a shot been fired, I would have gone on board the *Columbia* and shared her fate. We would have stormed Isla de Cobras, the nearest battery to the town, and turned its guns upon the palace of the Emperor. We would, God willing, have razed that palace and taken the Emperor himself and brought him home to the United States, to be no otherwise tortured than to bring him here and show him the real form and comeliness of *Civil Liberty* and *universal tolerance*, and then to send him back in safety to his own dominion, there to be the best missionary of American protection that could be sent to all South America, where protection, personal protection to American citizens—is so much needed!

This may seem like badinage now to you, but I tell you that it would have been an earnest enterprise, and as easy as it is for one North American of the United States' race of men, of the blood of the English and Scotch and Irish and Germans, to subdue ten of the Spanish or Portuguese race anywhere upon earth, even at the doors of their own homesteads, as is proved



by all the battles of the late Mexican campaigns. And, so far as South America is concerned, all that our Government has to do, is *to assert firmly this right of protection, and to convince them that we are in earnest in our demands, and there will never be any necessity to resort to force.* Indeed, wherever this protection is wanting, there is an inherent weakness in the nation which withholds or denies it. They are weak from ignorance, and wanting in all the elements of national strength. Such powers as England and the United States, by a wise coöperation in international policy, on subjects like this, could in another quarter of a century subdue all opposition to this potent means of making a common brotherhood among mankind. Therefore it is, that I for one have heartily rejoiced at every expedition fitted out by any of the larger and enlightened powers to such countries as that of Japan. A short sighted view of the war of Great Britain upon China would condemn it as immoral and unjust, and her East India conquests would seem to be mere and sheer desolations; but I am consoled for almost all British aggressions everywhere, except on the continents of the two Americas, and her oppression of Ireland, by the civilizing results which follow the march of her triumphs. Everywhere, under British laws, personal protection to our citizens is safe and sure, and I am willing for those laws to reign everywhere else than where the dominion justly belongs to ourselves, and the spirit of those laws we ourselves adopt. And whence came that spirit? How is it imbued? By nothing less divine than the faith and practice of Christianity itself. Christianity alone can make a brotherhood among men, and we need not expect these ameliorations from any other people than a people who have *homes*, who have altars of baptism, who have consciences enlightened by the Lord's Prayer and the Decalogue, and by the Sermon on the Mount, and who are strong enough in moral power, thence derived, to give laws to the world by a word, without a blow!

When you come in contact with the Despotisms of the Old World, on this subject, you meet with something much more obdurate even than the ignorance and weakness of the South American and Mexican States. In Turkey, "protection for the fanes" may be claimed and enforced, for Turkey is a weak barbarism, a dying dynasty. But the dynasties of Russia and Austria and Italy and France and Prussia, are comparatively strong, and strong enough yet awhile to "kick against the pricks!" To cite to them the examples of English and American liberty, is at once to excite their alarm. These examples are angels of light which must not enter their dark dominions. Russia is waging war upon Turkey for the privileges of conscience, for the rites of a Greek Church; and, yet, go to Russia to establish a law of *Magna Charta* and you would be in danger of the knout! Ask her to give the personal protection in her country to one of our citizens residing or traveling there, which we give to one of her citizens residing or traveling

here, and your request would be judged a seditious appeal to a revolution of her Government—an attempt at dethronement of her Despotism. Therefore it was, that I instinctively rejoiced at the decisive step taken by Capt. Ingraham in the case of Koszta. As Mr. Polk's Administration had sustained, nobly sustained, my mission in every claim of American protection which I had set up in Brazil for our citizens, and *all American rights as well as the rights of citizenship* to protection, I looked with anxiety to see what would be the action of our State Department upon the affair at Smyrna. Mr. Marcy's State paper soon relieved me. It was able and fully up to the occasion. And here let me say that it has not been fully or fairly understood, either in the country, or, (it seems from late debates,) in Congress. He pleaded *not* the defence of Captain Ingraham upon Koszta's rights *as a citizen*, nor can it be based upon the less perfect rights of him *as a man*. Mr. Marcy took the ground which can be and has been sustained, that *though he did not have the rights of American citizenship, yet he had other American rights*:—That protection was due and might well be given to *something short of citizenship*;—That interposition was not merely in such a case a good office, to be rendered or not at discretion; but it was *a perfect obligation of duty which had to be discharged in an imperative sense*. Oppression had driven the victim away from his own country, an exile and an outlaw. His oppressors had deprived him of protection, and yet proclaimed his allegiance. In their own jurisdiction they might have pursued him unto death. But he fled, escaped their jurisdiction, and came to our asylum, and he took the oath that *he would become one of our citizens—that he would owe us allegiance, do us duty as a freeman, obey our laws, and fight for our flag. This gave him an American right to become a citizen of the United States*. It was a *positive* right under our Naturalization Laws. Again, in the mean time, he went abroad. This he had a positive right to do, everywhere else than in Austrian dominions; and from everywhere else, except Austria, *he had a right to return to the United States, here to be naturalized and here to enjoy civil liberty*. He did not go to Austria, but was seized in another jurisdiction, where Austria had no legal sway, but where the sovereignty was too weak to protect him. To whom was he to appeal, and how? *As a man* only? Then it was an affair of *any* power who *would*, or of *no* power who would *not* interpose in his behalf. He had vague and undefined and imperfect rights only, and there was no conclusive duty of protection anywhere. But he had *a perfect right*, already partly legalized and inchoate, *to become an American citizen*; he had a perfect right *to return to America* as his asylum and home, and a perfect right already commenced, *here to enjoy civil liberty*; and *all those rights were invaded by Austria, out of her jurisdiction*, “where there was no eye to pity and no hand to save, unless *American power* was

there to protect these *American rights*. The *American power was there, and it did interpose*; and Amen, Amen say I!!

And this doctrine is not new under the sun. It is but a new phase of things as old as 1776 and 1812. During the Revolution, George III. had much better reason for hanging Whigs as traitors in these colonies, than Austria had to seize Koszta in Turkish dominions. At that period, Great Britain held to the maxim of tyranny—"Once a citizen, always a citizen." Yes! She, too, denied the right of forswearing allegiance, or the right of expatriation. She held that a man born a serf must grow up and remain a serf for all life-time—that he might cross the seas, and still be in the thralldom of his nativity; that he might cross mountains and lakes and rivers and continents, and still "but drag a lengthening chain,"—that he might "take the wings of the morning and fly to the uttermost parts of the earth,"—and yet there, upon sea or land, she would have the right to seize him for allegiance due to her; and if he had forsworn that allegiance, and bound himself to revolutions of resistance to her sovereignty, she might lawfully hang him for treason. She did hang some of the best American patriots under this execrable doctrine, until the American armies took and held hostages of retaliation against its enforcement. Nothing more strongly aroused the spirit of resistance than the practice of this maxim—"Once a citizen, always a citizen." Again, the policy of our Government, almost in the midst of arms, became at once to settle our vast public domain. As if by magic, as coming from inspiration, came that wisest of all our institutions, next to the Constitution of the United States, the great Land Ordinance of 1787. Before it, fell every feudal castle of old time. It had no prototype. It was unique and unexampled. By the simplest provisions of law, by East and West, North and South lines, *homes* were made for our people, almost without money and without price, and free from all litigation and strife about boundaries or titles, and we said to the oppressed and poor of all nations—"Ho! come and settle down to your rest—here is a vine and here is a fig tree!" Immigration was thus called, and the nations began to come, and they have not ceased to come! And the Constitution of our land was the first, in conjunction with this ordinance, to provide that Congress "*shall have power to establish an uniform rule of Naturalization*." This was the first organic movement against the maxim of tyrants—"Once a citizen, always a citizen." The Land laws bade the people come, and this commanded that they should be *naturalized*—that they should have the right of expatriation—that they should not *always* be slaves—that they should have a legal way to be free, and that in their freedom they should find the protection of American laws. The Naturalization Act of 1802 was passed, and in seven years thereafter the *Leopard* attacked the American flag again on board the *Chesapeake*, under the claim to impress English seamen in our service by force of the maxim—"Once a citizen,



always a citizen." Protection was assailed, also, in our neutral rights of commerce, and at last after a hard struggle, the second war with Great Britain was declared for "free trade and sailors' rights." This meant nothing else and nothing less than that the United States would protect *their people*, born wherever they might have been born, at home and abroad, on the sea and on the land—that they should have the right of expatriation and the right of American naturalization. It is enough to say that the last discussions between the two Governments of Great Britain and the United States put that issue at rest forever. The Right of Search has vanished, and is renounced; the right of naturalization is recognized by the most powerful of Christian nations, in every practical sense and intent. And what a happy result it has been for Great Britain as well as for the United States, that the latter have maintained the glorious privilege of independence in protecting immigration, every way, to these sacred shores! I cite the instance upon newspaper authority of the highest respectability, that in the last six years Irish immigrants here have sent back to their poor, distressed, and destitute kindred in unhappy Ireland, the sum of four and a half millions of pounds sterling of relief! How glorious in every Christian sense is this return of good to the Old World, for the past evil to the New!

But though the question has ceased forever, as between Great Britain and the United States, yet the issues of protection to our people arise in various forms throughout the globe. Immigration to us from Germany is opposed in every form. Cases are arising in Prussia, for example, which may call upon us to look further behind the *status of citizenship* than we were compelled to do in the case of Koszta. To the casuists who object to the protection afforded to him, I can put a puzzle which I hope may never have to be solved some of these days. Our policy, I repeat, is *immigration*. We have a giant continent to people; and institutions, I contend, which can embrace, and ought to embrace, a world as well as a continent. Prussia throws every obstacle in the way of her citizens emigrating to the United States. As yet her police confines its oppression to her own limits. Notwithstanding the vigilance of her authorities, thousands of her subjects escape in the emigrant ships, and land here safely to enjoy our freedom. As long as she confines her opposition to her own limits, we cannot, by the laws of nations, interpose to promote or to aid or abet the emigration to us. But suppose she should go farther, and send an armed force to sea, there on the highway of nations to arrest and search emigrant ships, and to seize and send back to military service her subjects who had already retired from her jurisdiction? The wail of those longing for liberty comes to us mournfully across the ocean—"We would emigrate—we, too, would be naturalized—we would that thy country were our country, and thy God our God! but we are seized on the high seas, and we are sent back to native bondage, because simply we were born



*slaves! The tyrant says—‘Once a citizen, always a citizen,’ and we shall never change our lot—the burden shall always be upon us!’* Suppose, I say, that this wail should not only come across the ocean, but that it is even heard by an American man-of-war on the high seas—that one of our frigates should witness a seizure and search of an emigrant ship *under any flag except that of Prussia*, (if that itself could be excepted!) What of the case? Shall our commander allow the seizure and the search, and the arrest of emigration to America out of the jurisdiction of Prussia or any other power on earth? No!—by all the laws of Christianity—No!—America *has the right* among nations *to have the escaped oppressed to come to her asylum*, with a free right of way across the high seas; and *once there*, the emigrant shall be safe—safe by the duty we owe ourselves as well as the rest of mankind, to give as much as we can of our free heritage of God’s earth to as many of the children of men as will come by our invitation to our homes and our altars! Where is the Ingraham or the Rousseau of our Navy, who would not interpose, and take the responsibility of getting medals or courts martial for his protection to *America’s rights*? *And yet here is a case where there is no inchoate right of citizenship.* The truth is, that our national rights multiply with our national responsibilities; that as we magnify in importance, in duties and obligations, we grow too in all the means and necessities of cases to discharge our duties and obligations. The rights are reciprocal with the responsibilities.

I have thus discussed the subject of protection, to show that it has a practical and earnest meaning to us, as a people. The extent of protection which you, gentlemen, seek, comes far short, I mean to say, of what we are bound to extend to ourselves. The pillar of cloud by day, and of fire by night, did not more vividly proclaim Providence to the chosen people of God, than events in our history declare the Christian Deity to us! The Revolution, throughout all its phases and antecedents—its Congress of 1776—its Committees of Safety—its State Legislatures and Resolves—its people and their meetings—its armies and George Washington—its State Papers and Diplomatic Correspondence—its Articles of Confederation—its temptations and trials, and its final triumph!—and then what followed; its fruits of land-laws—of a Constitution—of Washington’s Policy of Peace—of a Federal Judiciary—of State Governments—of Western Settlements—of Indian Wars—of the woodman’s log wood axe, and of the pioneer’s rifle—of common schools—of pulpits and free churches—of steamboats—of railroads—of telegraphs—of printing presses—of laws and learning—of sudden growth and expansion—of public domain from Atlantic to Pacific seas—of prowess in war—of unparalleled conquest—of sudden acquisition of gold—of wealth in production of human clothing and food—of ships of commerce—and all this by a reliance upon civil and moral power alone, and not upon standing armies

and a numerous navy. This, I say, was more than human—it comes alone from God and the Saviour of mankind! If ever any people ought to be—were obliged to be—a Christian people, in order to maintain their liberties, their franchises, their rights, and their strength, we ought to be Christian in our faith, in our hopes, and in our practice. That is all we now need to do—to keep in remembrance our divine origin and our divine end. God is our strength, and He alone is wise enough and strong enough to support a fabric as vast as this country of ours is already. The Christian law is the purest republican law, and every departure from it is weakness, to us especially, as a nation. The stern, unbending Christian virtues best become us as a people in our national, as well as in our individual relations to God and man. We must not become a proud and arrogant and grasping people. Humility and peace are our policy and strength. The true patriots will guard us from the accursed thirst for gold, from the avarice of commerce, from the materialism and rapid rush of the progress of the age. The schools will teach, and the pupils will preach New Testament tenets of an undefiled moral philosophy which came out of Nazareth. Civil engineering, and mathematics, and chemistry, so necessary to develop the giant physical proportions of this promised land of ours, must not be allowed to make new gods and national idols for our worship! And is this our state of fearful, wondrous prosperity, and *we*—*we* not entitled to be protected in the privileges you so meekly claim for the humblest of mankind throughout God's footstool of earth! *We* not have the rights of conscience—the right of worshipping God—the right of burial according to decent Christian rites on that footstool, except in the land we call *our* country, or in that spot we call *our* home! And, if we may send the missionary to the Heathen lands, may we not treat Heathens as pupils of national laws, and if we may persuade *them* to be Christians, may we not much more soberly go to the powers which profess to be civilized and confess Christ, and *ask them to follow His Divine example*? Surely our Government will need no constraint from public sentiment to compel it to administer the very spirit of our civil institutions—that spirit in which they *must* “live, and move, and have their being.”

I have, gentlemen, hastily written this reply to your invitation, and it goes to you without being transcribed or properly corrected. It is but a brief of my views, and but an impulse of my feelings on the topics touched. I beg you, if you think it worthy of publication at all, to see that it be printed correctly, and to accept it as the best response which my engagements will permit me to make to your kind and complimentary invitation. I am heartily with you in your plan of American protection, and

Very truly, your fellow-citizen,

HENRY A. WISE.

To Anson G. Phelps, W. W. Stone, Mortimer De Motte, Jno. W. Corson, Committee  
E. R. Fairchild and R. Baird, Corresponding Secretaries.

## Letter from the Hon. Judge Jessup.

Montrose, January 20th, 1854.

REV. AND DEAR SIR,

The invitations to be present at, and address your meeting on the 26th inst. are duly received. That of the 30th ult. reached here during my absence. Upon my return I engaged in the business of our court, and hoped until this afternoon, that I might give a favorable response; but the court continues its sessions through next week, and my professional engagements therein preclude the hope of being with you.

My trust is that your meeting will be accompanied by successful results.

*The boon* we most prize is Liberty of Conscience, and Freedom of Religious worship. No assaults upon *personal liberty* would in this nation be more earnestly resisted than would an attempt to enslave our consciences and destroy our Religious Liberty. No price can measure their value. Oceans of blood have been spilt in their defence, and oceans more would flow freely, if they were invaded. The attempt would find *no friends* in this land. One united feeling would rush to their support.

And it is only *at home* that these inestimable treasures are prized!

Our Government negotiates year after year for the regulations of our trade in articles of trifling value.

It sends its navy to protect the commerce and the *persons* of her citizens in every portion of the earth. It looks with jealousy upon every movement which threatens in any degree our just rights. The least indignity offered to the humblest of our citizens in foreign lands is resented, and for it reparation demanded.

We claim an equality in every foreign port for *all* our citizens, with the men of every other land; and yet, we submit in many of them to a total denial of every religious right. We give up all liberty of worship and yield our dearest rights.

The day is past, when as a People we ought quietly to yield these high privileges. Too many of our citizens, seeking wealth and pleasure and riches, are resident in foreign lands, to admit of longer silence. Too great interests rest upon our action, to admit of further delay. The time for action has come, and if it ever be made effectual for our own protection, and for happy influences upon the natives, it must begin with *our* government. No where else on earth is active religious liberty so fully secured, and no government can therefore with such propriety enter upon negotiations, having for their object the entire security of that liberty for her citizens in foreign lands.

I have little doubt of the readiness of the President to engage in this important work. And though I am not unaware of the difficulties which surround the subject, yet I have as little doubt, that decided, firm, honest diplomaey may secure it; and no page so bright would be inscribed in the history of his ad-



ministration, as that which recorded his successful establishment of liberty of conscience, worship, and sepulture for *all* our citizens in *all* the countries with which we have diplomatic relations.

My prayer is that God will greatly prosper your efforts.

Truly yours,

WM. JESSUP.

Rev. E. R. Fairchild, D. D.

---

The following Resolutions were then read by Professor Crosby, of the University of New-York.

*Resolved*, i. That, in the judgment of this meeting, it is the duty of the Government of these United States to protect our fellow citizens residing or traveling in foreign lands, in their rights of conscience and religious worship, as well as their rights of person and of property; and that, wherever it has not been done, these rights should be secured by the solemn compacts of international treaties.

*Resolved*, ii. That, in the opinion of this meeting, it is reasonable that the Government should demand of other nations the acknowledgment of these rights, and the guarantee of the same, inasmuch as the concession of them would only be a reciprocation of what the Constitution of the United States secures to the citizens of every foreign land who visit our shores, whether they be Protestants or Roman Catholics, Christians or Jews.

*Resolved*, iii. That this meeting approves, in the fullest manner, of the efforts of two distinguished Senators at the last Session of Congress; one of whom (General Cass) called the attention of the Government and the Public to this important subject, and the other, (Mr. Underwood, then a member of the Senate from Kentucky,) in behalf of the Committee on Foreign Relations in that body, submitted an admirable report, which closed with the following resolutions:

“*Resolved*, That it would be just and wise, on the part of the Government of the United States, in future treaties with foreign nations, to secure, if practicable, to our citizens residing abroad, the right of worshiping God, freely and openly, according to the dictates of their own consciences, by providing that ‘they shall not be disturbed, molested, or annoyed in any manner, on account of their religious belief, nor in the proper exercise of their peculiar religion, either in their own private houses, or in churches, chapels or other places appointed for public worship; and that they shall be at liberty to build and maintain places of worship in convenient situations, interfering in no way with, but respecting, the religion and customs of the country in which they reside.’

“*Resolved further*, That it would be just and wise in our future treaties with foreign nations, to secure our citizens residing abroad the right to purchase and own burial places, and to bury any of our citizens dying abroad in such places, with those



religious ceremonies and observances deemed appropriate by surviving friends of the deceased."

*Resolved*, iv. That inasmuch as Mr. Underwood's report was not acted upon by the Senate, (from want of time, it is believed,) this meeting would respectfully request the editors of the secular as well as the religious press to publish it, together with the resolutions appended to it, in order that the subject may be more fully brought before the people.

*Resolved*, v. That Congress be, and they are hereby, requested to pass the above-stated resolutions, or others similar in character, as in their wisdom may seem best. And to secure this end, this meeting would respectfully invite their fellow-citizens in all parts of the country to address, without delay, both Houses of that body, by memorial, praying that such action may take place.

*Resolved*, vi. That this meeting, being fully of the opinion that every American citizen who goes to foreign countries to make known the doctrines and blessings of Christianity to his fellow-men—in obedience to the command of the Saviour, "*to preach the Gospel to every creature*"—is as much entitled to the protection of the Government as the merchant who goes abroad for business, or the traveler who goes for pleasure, so long as he contravenes no law of the political governments of those countries.

*Resolved*, vii. That this meeting, holding these views, rejoices in the course which the Government has pursued in interfering with vigor, as it has done, in the case of the Rev. Dr. King, an American Missionary in Greece, and would express the hope that it will not relax its efforts till full justice be done in his behalf.

*Resolved*, viii. That, in the opinion of this meeting, in view of the wonderful changes which are coming over the entire civilized world, by the vast expansion of commerce and the great augmentation of the facilities of travel—bringing the people of all countries, in great numbers, into contact with each other, to an extent wholly unparalleled in the history of the human race—the basis of the Law of Nations should be enlarged, so as to include other subjects besides "*wars, treaties, navigation, and foreign commerce.*" The rights and privileges of foreign residents and travelers ought to become matters of regulation.

*Resolved*, ix. That, in the judgment of this meeting, the time has come when the governments of Christendom, which know the blessings and advantages of religious liberty, should make all proper efforts to secure its recognition and prevalence in all nations—from the conviction that it will greatly advance freedom of intercourse and extension of trade, allay national animosities, remove causes of war, promote the useful arts and sciences, and increase and strengthen the bonds of brotherhood, which the Christian Religion, rightly understood and truly practiced, invariably creates.

*Resolved, x.* That this meeting feels the more impelled to express this conviction from the additional consideration, that it has seen, with great astonishment and grief, the attempts in certain quarters to resuscitate some of the worst and most odious claims which were held in the dark ages—denying the right of the people to religious liberty, justifying persecution, and maintaining the subordination of the Civil to the Ecclesiastical Power; thus seeking to reëstablish a Hierarchical Despotism, beneath which Christendom entire groaned for a thousand years, and from which only a part of it has yet escaped. These sentiments, so repugnant to the spirit of Christianity, and hostile to the best interests of Humanity, the meeting are happy to believe are not held by the enlightened *People* of any land.

*Resolved, xi.* That this meeting is fully aware that, in the prosecution of this important work, the greatest prudence will be requisite. It advocates the use of no means but those of reasonable argument and kind persuasion; but it believes that with perseverance the great end will in time be accomplished; and that it is right and proper that these United States and England should take the lead in this movement, for they enjoy the largest amount of religious liberty, and allow all who come to their shores to partake of it as fully as native-born citizens and subjects. This meeting cannot but believe that the day is near when the world will hear no more (as it has done within a few weeks) of a man's being put to death for changing his religion, or of any one being oppressed and persecuted on religious grounds. Both Christianity and Humanity demand that such a day shall come, and that its coming should be hastened.

*Resolved, xii.* That although this meeting are far from holding the opinion that the infinite God has left it a matter of indifference what man shall believe on the subject of religion, (for He has given us His Word and Spirit to teach and guide us,) yet they deny that he owes accountability in regard to his religious opinions to any man, or any body of men, whether called a Church or a State, but to Him alone who is the Lord of the conscience, and the Judge of all men.

*Resolved, xiii.* And finally, this meeting declares that it equally abhors and stigmatizes persecution and oppression for the sake of religion, whether seen in Protestant or Roman Catholic countries; and it deploras alike the intolerance which still prevails in some Protestant countries in northern Europe, and that which exists in Austria, all Italy excepting the noble kingdom of Sardinia, France, Spain, Mexico and some other Roman Catholic countries. It considers all such intolerance, wherever found, to be disgraceful to Christianity, and revolting to Humanity.

## Speech of David Dudley Field, Esq.

The Resolutions having been read, David Dudley Field, Esq. arose, moved that they be adopted, and delivered an eloquent and able address, of which the following is but an imperfect sketch.

I rise, Mr. Chairman, to second these resolutions. If there was any one idea which, more than others, animated the founders of these States, it was that of Religious Freedom. The Pilgrim Fathers of New-England brought it with them from their persecutions in England, and their exile in Holland, when they sought and found, in the western wilderness, freedom to worship God. The Dutch founders of this City brought it with them from that Fatherland which was a refuge of the persecuted for opinion's sake throughout Europe. In Pennsylvania, William Penn, the head of a persecuted and despised sect, proclaimed religious freedom to every inhabitant of his peaceful commonwealth. The Roman Catholic founders of Maryland, disgusted with the strifes of rival sects in the Old World, proclaimed the equality of all in the New. And in Carolina; to which the Huguenots fled from the fanaticism of their countrymen for religion's sake, there was laid the foundation of universal toleration. This fundamental idea of Religious Freedom was preserved in our fundamental laws. The Constitution of the United States declares that Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; and all the Constitutions of this State, from that which was first made amid the disquietudes and perils of the Revolutionary contest to the last, which was framed in the midst of our abounding prosperity, contained this remarkable declaration—worthy to be held in perpetual remembrance—that the free profession and enjoyment of religious opinion and practice, without discrimination or preference, shall be forever allowed, in this State, to all mankind.

Such being our idea of the right of conscience, it does not comport with our sense of right, nor our self respect, that we should lose those rights when our business, or our pleasure, calls us abroad. If the nations of the world maintained the Japanese policy of excluding foreigners altogether from their shores, there would not be so much cause for complaint; but it is far otherwise. The nations of the world are bound to each other by innumerable ties of brotherhood, of relation, and mutual help, and the observance towards each other of various rules of comity. Nay, more, they acknowledge and proclaim it as a rule of public law, that a citizen going abroad carries with him his nationality—that a temporary absence does not deprive him of a jot or tittle of his national character.

Not only is this the general doctrine of Christendom, but our own country has maintained it with a firmness, and carried it out to an extent of which the history of the world furnishes scarcely a parallel. We hold that



an American citizen going abroad has the palpable and visible shield of his country for ever hanging over him—that he may stand unabashed as an equal even in the presence of princes, and that wherever he is, if he demands protection as an American citizen, he shall have it. This the President has proclaimed from the steps of the Capitol, and our Secretaries have asserted it in State papers. Our Ministers have maintained it at Foreign Courts, and our Commanders, from the sides of our wooden walls, have proclaimed it in language which neither thrones nor scepters can ignore. And even the pride of the ancient House of Hapsburgh has suffered the humiliation of surrendering to force what was demanded of it in the name of American citizenship.

Shall we be less sensitive to our religious rights than to those which are purely political? Is there any reason why we should maintain the one and surrender the other? On the contrary, as the rights of conscience are the chiefest of all rights, they should be the first to be guarded and the last to be surrendered. We ask for no exclusive privileges. We do not seek to make the occasion of our being abroad an opportunity for propagandism. We do not assume to assail the institutions, civil or religious, of any other country, by act or word; but we maintain that an American citizen going abroad, carries with him all his personal rights, and the chiefest among those rights are the rights of conscience with all their incidents. It is true that our country has hitherto done much by treaties; and ever since the time of Franklin we have endeavored to gain all we could for humanity and the rights of man, but still much remains to be done. If one of us travels into Palestine he is sure to meet with insult, and he cannot tread upon the site of the Ancient Temple without incurring the risk of instant death. In Greece, the classic land of freedom, an American missionary has met with persecutions and annoyances for preaching the Gospel in a way not agreeable to the Oriental Church. And I may be permitted to say, Mr. Chairman, (turning to the President,) for I myself am a personal witness, that no person could be more unobtrusive and less offensive to any country than Dr. King, who preaches in his own house to a little band of his own family and a few natives, in the humble character of a sincere Christian. In Rome, the capital of the ancient, and the semi-capital of the modern world, the English Church is thrust without the walls, and the humble American chapel, where our own citizens are permitted to worship, lives by sufferance in an upper chamber, under the protection of the American Legation. And we are told that in Spain, within the last year, the Protestants of England have been denied the ordinary rights of Christian burial. Whether the spirit and dignity of the English people will allow them to submit to indignities like this, in a country which they have saved more than once from utter destruction, I will not undertake to say, though I never will believe it. But sure I am that the dignity and spirit of the American people will never allow them to



submit to the like injustice. We demand not as a boon, but as a right, that American citizens going into other countries, shall have all their personal and religious rights protected—that they shall be allowed public places of worship and burial,—that they shall not be compelled to observances repugnant to their religious convictions, and that they shall be allowed to celebrate those Christian rights which are their best solace in life, and pledge of their hopes hereafter.

---

Speech of the Rev. Stuart Robinson.

Rev. Stuart Robinson, of Baltimore then came forward and presented the following resolution:

“Resolved, That while we deprecate all political and social violence arising out of the questions of religion at home, and hold to the policy of ‘non-intervention’ in every reasonable sense of that term, and no ‘entangling alliances’ with nations abroad; yet, accepting as a practical reality the great organic principle to which our country is committed before the world, in the Bill of Rights, that ‘Every man has a natural and inalienable right to worship God according to the dictates of conscience and reason;’ and holding this right to be an essential element of American citizenship, we consider it the duty of our Government to press, by every peaceable method, the claim to the exercise of this right for our own citizens in every part of the world; and to refuse to recognise in any form, as a principle controlling the application of international law, the dogma—so absurd, and so utterly in the face of our national first principles—that governments may of right interfere with, and prohibit, the worship of God according to conscience and reason.”

I consider it a misfortune that since we began to call public attention to these principles—nay, even so recently as since the report of Mr. Underwood in the United States Senate, a year ago—so very remarkable a revolution has occurred in the popular feeling, that whereas before there was a most singular apathy touching the right of freedom of speech and of religion, and questions relating thereto; now, on the contrary, there prevails a tendency to excess of feeling and popular outbreak so alarming as to fill the more reflecting of the people with concern, and to call forth from our National Senate grave admonition and rebuke. I speak of this as a misfortune to our cause, because it gives the enemies of religious freedom occasion to break the intrinsic force of these great principles on the minds of the unreflecting, by associating them with these unwise and dangerous disorders; for we know that the most successful of all the arts of the enemies of truth is to

mar her attractions for the minds of men by sending her forth clad in the dress of falsehood and delusion.

Now let it be understood that we, as the advocates of freedom of worship, have no responsibility direct, or indirect, for the recent excitement; nay, so far from it, not only do our principles utterly forbid any interference with religious opinions, either by monarch or mob, but our *interest*, as members of various religious communities, is obviously against it. If men will give us credit for no higher ground of action, then our *interest*, I say requires us to demand for Roman Catholics their rights, since everything that restrains their privileges must obviously soon lead to restraining our own. And, sir, more emphatically, as evangelical Christians, must we naturally be averse to the exercise of any authority over religious faith by the multitude, since, according to our creed, touching the natural enmity of the carnal heart against the truth of God, in any case of appeal to the multitude on a question of religion, we know the decision at that tribunal must necessarily be against us.

The true cause of the present popular excitement—a cause more than sufficient to account for it—I apprehend, is the shamelessly un-American doctrines which a whole class of journals have been disseminating—and the corresponding un-American measures which the endorsers and abettors of these journals have been attempting to carry out,—the spirit of virulence and malignity which have characterized the advocacy of those measures; and, perhaps, I may add, the apathy and unconcern manifested in regard to them in many of the quarters towards which the people have been accustomed to look for direction and for the defence of their principles.

As I ever make it a principle to charge no man with opinions without giving him the advantage of his own statement of them—and lest in the excitement of extempore address I may be misunderstood, I ask your indulgence, while I read, by way of foot notes, the proofs of the positions just laid down, as to the true authors and the true causes of the recent excitements. Of the journals to which I allude there are, perhaps, a score—all of them ecclesiastical organs, yet, at the same time, political journals. I cannot cite from all; but what is true of those from which I cite is, in substance, true of all,—not one of them having yet, so far as I know, protested against, but all of them having endorsed, directly or indirectly, the doctrines which I quote from those cited. I quote more extensively from Brownson's Review—first, because of its superiority in point of talents; secondly, because this journal has the formal endorsement of the whole Roman Catholic Hierarchy—six Archbishops and thirty-three Bishops; thirdly, because his views evidently have much to do with shaping the views of all the others, and are disavowed by none of them; fourthly, because we are expressly told, that, “his conversion is an epoch in the history of the American Church,

and American Catholic Journalism has taken a new tone from him,"—*Shepherd of the Valley*, Dec. 31, 1853; and, lastly, because we are expressly informed by this journal in its own pages, that its editor writes nothing but with the sanction of his Bishop; and in the very last number, the public is informed that in undertaking the work, the editor had "*these principles*" assigned to him to maintain and defend in it. (See Brownson's Review, January, 1854, in article "You go too far.")

I charge these journals with disseminating un-American doctrines. Here is the proof:

1. It is an organic principle of the political creed of our country, declared in the Bill of Rights, "That all power is vested in, and consequently derived from, the people,—that magistrates are their trustees and servants."—*Virginia Bill of Rights*.

But these assert the following directly opposite dogmas. "The Church (in person of the Pope) bears by Divine right, both swords, (temporal and spiritual.) The temporal sovereign holds it (the temporal sword of power) subject to *her order*, to be exercised under her direction."—*Brownson's Review*, January, 1854—page 57.

"We believe the direct *temporal authority* of the Pope as Vicar of Jesus Christ on earth."—*Brownson's Review*, January, 1854—page 88 *et passim*.

"If the brilliant T. Francis Meagher had been instructed, from his youth up, in the true temporal supremacy of the Church, we should not have now to seem to treat him with inhospitality."—*Brownson's Review*, January, 1854, page 106.

"Indeed, we can better endure open, avowed Protestantism itself, than stingy, narrow-minded, frozen-hearted Gallicanism, always trying to split the difference between Peter and Cæsar, God and the Devil."—*Brownson's Review*, January, 1854, page 94.

"The notion that religion has nothing to do with politics has betrayed many simple souls into active opposition to the religion of their fathers; it is well that such souls should be unchanged. The Church judges rulers as well as the ruled. The spirit of the age still claims absolute independence for the civil power, substituting the *People* for Kings and Princes. To refute the errors of our times it has been necessary to fall back upon the *strong papal* doctrines of this and the preceding article."—*St. Louis Shepherd of the Valley*, July 16, 1853.

I add one other statement from a communication of "Apostolicus," in the Baltimore Clipper, in Spring of '53, in reply to "Catholicus," of the New-York Tribune, on Brownson's doctrines:

"I say with Brownson, that if the Church should declare *that the Constitution and every existence* of this or any other country should be *extinguished*, it is a solemn audience of God himself, and *every good Catholic would*

*be bound*, under the penalty of the terrible punishment pronounced against the disobedient, *to obey*."

So much for this doctrine of power.

Again: 2. The Bill of Rights declares that "Every individual has a natural and inalienable right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience and reason."

But by Archbishop Hughes, religious liberty is defined to be "*the right to worship God in the manner God has appointed*"—evidently reserving the right of the Pope, or the State, under the Pope, to determine what that manner is.

"Religious Liberty, in the sense of a liberty possessed by every man to choose his religion, is one of the most wretched delusions ever foisted on this age by the father of all deceit."—*The Rambler*, 1853.

"The Church is of necessity intolerant. Heresy she endures when and where she must; but she hates it, and directs all her energies to its destruction. If Catholics ever gain an immense numerical majority, religious freedom in this country is at an end. So our enemies say. So we believe."—*Shepherd of the Valley*, November 23, 1851.

"The liberty of heresy and unbelief is *not* a natural right. \* \* \* All the rights the *sects* have or can have are derived from the State, and rest on expediency. As they have in their character of sects, hostile to the true religion, no rights under the law of nature or the law of God, they are neither wronged nor deprived of liberty if the State refuses to grant them any rights at all."—*Brownson's Review*, October '52, page 456.

"We found the age clamoring for religious liberty \* \* \* maintaining that every man has the natural right to be of what religion he chooses, thus denying the essential distinction between truth and falsehood, virtue and vice. Were we to be silent and suffer manifest error to be imbibed by our Catholic communities? \* \* \* We found a very general disposition among the Catholic laity to separate religion from politics, to emancipate politics from the Christian law, to vote God out of the State, and set up the people against the Almighty. Was this, in these revolutionary times, to be passed over in silence, and no effort made to arrest the tide of political atheism?"—*Brownson's Review*, Jan. '54, p. 101.

Let this suffice. *Ex uno disce omnes*, for those views have met with no word of disapprobation from any journal of that Faith in the country—but on the contrary with approbation and endorsement. Again,

3. The bill of rights declares—"All men are born equally free and independent."

But these writers declare:

"Equality is an idle dream, an empty word—fit only to be inscribed on the blood-red banner of the Atheistical Revolutionist. \* \* \*



“The strength and glory of a nation depends not on the vulgar, the commonalty, the servile, or the simple, but on its freemen, its gentlemen, its nobility. It is one of the saddest as well as one of the silliest mistakes of our age, that the few may be safely overlooked, and for all that is great and good and wise and just in the action of the State or of society, reliance must be placed on the many, the *masses* so called. But a nation is great, good and just, only in its freemen, its noblemen; and a great nation without nobles, titled or untitled, is an unheard-of anomaly.”—*Brownson's Oration at Mount St. Mary's, Md. June 30, 1853.*

“The sorriest sight to us is a Catholic throwing up his cap and shouting, ‘All hail Democracy.’”—*Brownson's Rev. Oct. '52, p. 554-8.*

“We think that the ‘masses’ were never less happy, less respectable and less respected than they have been since the Reformation, and particularly within the last fifty or one hundred years—since Lord Brougham caught the mania of teaching them to read, and communicated the disease to a large proportion of the English nation, of which in spite of all our talk, we are too often the servile imitators.”—*Shepherd of the Valley, Oct. 22, 1853.*

But my limited space forbids me to multiply, as I might indefinitely, and from other journals, these specimens. Let it not be supposed, either, that these doctrines are mere theoretical abstractions. On the contrary, they form the life and spirit of the practical politics of these journals and their ecclesiastical endorers.

The political issues recently raised on the School Question, is a case in point—one that needs little illustration, since it has been forced upon the consideration of the public in a manner to make all familiar with it. A change of ground, and a change of tactics has of late taken place in the opposition to the schools, precisely in accordance with the doctrines just cited. Once the objection was not to the theory of public schools, but merely to having the Bible read in them. Many amiable people, both Protestant and Roman Catholic, were made to believe, that the whole trouble was with the “sectarianism” of the public schools, in permitting the Protestant Bible to be read. But now the difficulty is that the schools are “Godless” and “Atheistical;” that “The education we are laboring to give American children in our common schools is only fitted to make them *infidels, libertines, sharpers and rogues.*”—*Brownson's Oration at St. Mary's, p. 20.*

From the same quarter from which of old came the cry against the schools as sectarian, now comes the declaration that—

“The enemies of religion and society \* \* \* seize upon the schools and seek to control the education of the young. To accomplish their purposes *they have only to exclude religion from the schools, under the plea of sectarianism.*”—*Brownson's Oration at St. Mary's, p. 18 and 19.*

And the whole idea of education for the people, even in the sense of teaching them to read, is openly opposed; thus

"We are not the friends of popular education as at present understood. We do not believe that the *masses*, as our modern reformers insultingly call the laboring class, are one wit *more happy, more respectable*, or better informed for knowing how to read. \* \* In view of these and other facts, we, on our own private account, and not as a Catholic, but as a prudent man and as a good citizen, *unhesitatingly declare that we regard the invention of PRINTING as the reverse of a blessing*; and our modern ideas of education as essentially erroneous."—*Shepherd of the Valley, Oct. 22.*

Sir, I think we are beginning now to let the light in a little upon the mystery of the popular effervescences which have marked the last year or two; and of the hostility towards Romanism which has manifested itself at the polls, and in popular tumults. When we reflect that our people are "*constitutionally vain*" of their "people's colleges," we cannot be surprised if hostility to the schools on such grounds should stir the blood of the people.

Nor do these theoretic doctrines develop themselves only in opposition to the schools. They enter into the views of these writers on all the political questions of the day, and break out into most violent and unpatriotic hostility to the spirit and measures of the Government—especially its foreign policy. Thus, on the great question of the relations of our country to the world—

"Speaking with an eye to the immediate future, there are but three great Powers of the first order in the world: the United States, Russia, and Austria. The Russian and American are the two great aggressive powers of the age, and they threaten to meet ere long, in China or India, to dispute the empire of the world, and the triumph of either will be the triumph of Heathenism and the oppression of the Church of God. \* \* \* Where, if not in Austria, under God and His Church, the hope of Christian freemen," &c.—*Brownson's Review, January 54—pp. 31-2.*

In every question between our country and any of the papal nations of Europe, these writers are uniformly against their country.

Thus in the recent Koszta case—

"He (Captain Ingraham) mistook his duties, and suffered his zeal to get the better of his judgment. But, as his Government has approved his conduct, we must hold it, and not him, responsible for the insult offered to the Austrian flag. He was probably not initiated into the plot, and was used as a blind tool by the revolutionists. The secret of the whole transaction it is not difficult to divine. It was to get up a war, if possible, with Austria, in accordance with the plans and ardent wishes of Ludwig Kossuth. For this purpose, we doubt not, Koszta returned, or was ordered by Kossuth to return to Turkey, and very possibly with the knowledge and approbation of our *Jacobinical Government*."—*Brownson's Review, January 1854—pp. 80-81.*

These illustrations of the unpatriotic politics of these writers might be

multiplied indefinitely. I must content myself with this specimen or two, (and they are by no means the most singular,) and refer those disposed to examine, to the columns of any number of any Roman Catholic journal of the last two years.

I have intimated in the third place, sir, that not only have such theories of government, and such practical politics as are calculated to arouse the people been advocated, but also that this advocacy has been in a spirit of virulence and abuse well adapted to inflame the resentment of the people. Nor can I help thinking that such a tone has been assumed with a design to provoke—since they seem to know better. It is amazing to contrast the meek protestations of these editors, and, I may add, of several ecclesiastical pronouncements, against all violation of the spirit of peace and love, and all wrangling of the different religious communions against each other, &c., with the practical application of these homilies, as seen in the examples of their authors. I refer here again to a few, by way of specimen :

A meeting in this city, a year ago, remarkable for its dignity and lofty spirit—simply to express the sympathy of American freemen with the sufferings of fellow Christians, imprisoned for conscience's sake abroad—is openly denounced and vilified with every epithet, by the ecclesiastical organ of Archbishop Hughes, and, indeed, vilified by the latter dignitary himself, but in his usual style of *inucendo*. The *Freeman's Journal* informed its readers of "the utter scurrility and low vulgar buffoonery, the ribald jest and mockery of Baird and Cox, Murray and Bethune, and others of the same stamp and character." This however, is not surprising, since, in a formal card to the public, this mouth-piece of Archbishop Hughes declares :

"I would consider it equally stultifying to my reason as a man, and abhorrent to my principles as a Christian gentleman, to acknowledge the propriety of using reverent language respecting Protestant clergymen."

See card of J. A. McMaster, in the *New-York Courier and Enquirer*, March 2, 1853.

But, sir, this rancorous spirit has not been confined, in its manifestations, to "the sympathizing parsons." No public man, however honored, who in any way dared to countenance the principles of freedom, by sympathy with the oppressed, has escaped their abuse. The Mayor of New-York was admonished by the *Boston Pilot* that "Catholics would remember him" for presiding at that meeting. General Cass, for the sin of making a speech in the Senate in favor of free worship and of rights of conscience for Americans abroad, was kindly commiserated for his "confusion of ideas," and the fear is expressed that "his pleading will be treated as driveling by foreign States," in a public letter from the Archbishop of New-York. The *Freeman's Journal* boastingly informs the world that if Mr. Hastings, Chaplain at the American Consulate in Rome, makes a single convert, "he will be

kicked out of Rome, though Mr. Cass (Jr.) should bundle up his traps and follow him."

The grave Quarterly of Brownson condescended to declare—"We are glad to see Gen. Cass laid upon the shelf, for we can never support a man who turns radical in his old age."—*Review*, Oct. 1852.

The same tone of bitterness has characterized the language of these writers toward every other public man of the country whose views conflicted with the foregoing principles.

For his famous letter to the Austrian Minister, Brownson says, in the *Review*:

"Mr. Webster owes his failure to the Hulsemann Letter, and his after-dinner Speech and Toast at the Kossuth banquet. When such a man as Mr. Webster courts the mob, he is sure to fail."—*Review*, Oct. 1852.

Mr. Everett, while Secretary of State, with President Fillmore's approbation, wrote a courteous and dignified note to the Grand Duke of Tuscany, requesting the release of the Madiati. For that mortal sin both were complimented thus by the Freeman's Journal on retiring from office—an occasion on which ordinary political antagonists, however hostile, make it a point to speak in terms of courtesy and respect:

"De Laroche-Heron, to whose pen the Univers owes much, avenges the *cause of common sense against* the Unitarian Ex's. It does not escape the independent judgment of the Univers that the administration *now happily defunct, has been as bigoted as it has been imbecile*. The Univers congratulates the country upon having elected a statesman for President, and for permitting the Unitarian ex-preacher, late Secretary of State, to return to his pulpit to proclaim that Jesus is not God, and Mr. Fillmore himself to become a village lawyer."

When I read, sir, the other day, the speeches of Messrs. Cass and Everett in the Senate, I was forcibly impressed with the thought, that whatever judgment men might form of the correctness of their position, no man could contrast their tone and spirit with the language of these journals without feeling, that *in these remarks of theirs there was more* of the spirit of Him, "who, when he was reviled, reviled not again," than has been manifested in all these officially *religious journals for a whole year together*.

Need I mention the course pursued toward the patriots Meagher and Mitchel for daring to denounce Austrian tyranny? This same spirit of vituperation and abuse has been manifested not only in political matters, but even toward the most ordinary enterprises of philanthropy and humanity. Not only have our foreign Missionaries been vilified, but also the efforts of the humane to relieve the bodily wants of the poor and miserable have not escaped their abuse. Not to cite others of the innumerable cases that might be mentioned, I may refer to the remarkable instance of the philanthropic



Mission in the Five Points in this City. It would hardly have been supposed that religious bigotry would have looked with jealousy on an effort to save wretches so poverty-stricken and degraded. One could almost imagine the devil himself would think it too small a matter to fight about. Yet nothing can exceed in bitterness of calumny and abuse the assaults made upon these humane and benevolent men and women who undertook this labor of love. Mr. Pease, the missionary himself, was assailed in the columns of the ecclesiastical organ of the Archbishop as a swindler and an impostor, and his co-laborers in the Sunday-School vilified as loafers, &c.

And the measures and acts of these men have been not less inflammatory than their language. The question of the public schools has been pertinaciously pressed upon unwilling Legislatures and City Councils, in defiance of the reiterated decision of the popular vote in their favor. The threat has been continually made that no rest should be allowed till the arrogant demands of this party shall have been carried. For a long course of years attempts have been made to put down popular meetings for the discussion of questions relating in any way to Romanism, by the brute force and ruffianism of the unthinking and reckless portion of our foreign population. While renegade lecturers have been applauded for itinerating through the country, blaspheming and reviling not only Protestantism, but the Bill of Rights and the political measures directly founded upon it—any attempt to defend the religious and political faith of the people by a method calculated to reach the masses of the people, has been stigmatized and vilified—and the passions of ruffianism roused to put the attempt down by violence.

Thus, in a most offensive manner have these un-American views been obtruded upon us. Why, sir, not over a month since, in the prevalence of some excitement in one of our cities, as if unwilling to lose any opportunity of obtruding these odious notions and ideas upon the people, a certain ecclesiastic, whose official character no law of ours can recognize, most impertinently sends forth his ecclesiastical proclamation, side by side with that of the Mayor of our greatest city—by way of supplementing the implied failure of the Mayor's power to keep the peace—prescribing to his ecclesiastical subjects the *limits within which* he desired them to behave themselves! And, in reply to the indignant remonstrance of an influential journal against such an un-American style of doing things, the mouth-piece of that ecclesiastical dared boldly, in the midst of the public excitement, to predict the coming of the time when—

*“Trembling Mayors and embarrassed Governors shall appeal to Catholic Bishops to lend them their most active exertions toward poising on its basis the fabric of our Republic and the hopes of the Constitution.”—Freeman's Journal, January 14, 1854.*

Sir, I will venture a step farther, and say that nothing could have been

better *designed*, even if it had been most studiously designed to aggravate the tendency to violence of popular feeling, than the time chosen for the display, the man chosen to make it, and the manner in which the man has made the display of the fact of a foreign ecclesiastical control over and its relation to this country, than that which is connected with the coming into our country of the foreigner who has attracted of late so much attention, to say nothing of the necessary effect of his coming upon the feelings of the foreign portion of our people, who have been driven here by violence (and here I have nothing to say of the charges laid against him by the foreigners) yet the effect upon our own people could not but have been foreseen; coming among them and exercising authority as a judge in a matter purely evil, and affecting rights of property, while at the same time a mystery yet unsolved shrouded his true official status towards our Government, what else could have been expected than that the popular mind would have contemplated him with suspicion; especially under the excitement already raised by the causes already related?

With all the light we now have from the recent call for information upon the Executive, there is still no solution of the mystery. Even were his character determined to be that of a quasi-ambassador, in that case the selection of the man has been particularly unfortunate. When President Polk made the suggestion that our Government would not be displeased at receiving a diplomatic agent from Rome, he had the sagacity to suggest that such agent ought not to be an ecclesiastic. Here, however, we have an ecclesiastic, and perhaps to the foreigners here, the most objectionable of all the ecclesiastics; and he, while yet his true character, whether a public or a private man, is not yet determined by the Government, is assuming (in the popular mind) to play the *judge*, and more than that, to pronounce decisions which are in the face of our national ideas of right. But I am wandering aside from my point.

I refer thus at length to these things simply by way of accounting for the recent unfortunate manifestations of violent feeling toward the abettors of such opinions by the populace. And, sir, I have ventured to add, as probably an additional cause for the present state of feeling among the populace, that these anti-American doctrines and anti-American manifestations of feeling, have been allowed to pass almost without rebuke from men of high position in civil and political influence. The leading political journals of this country have, with a few exceptions, been silent on the subject—many of them breaking silence only to insinuate rebuke of all discussion of these principles. In some cases, even the authority of official position has been trained to put down such discussion.

Now, sir, taking these facts into view, we can no longer wonder at, however much we may regret and disapprove of, the recent tendency to violence

in our country. Our people will not bear patiently everything. No people will. Even the tyrants of the Old World dare not chafe too much the spirit of their slaves.

I stand not here, sir, I will not stand up anywhere, to justify mob-violence. My religion and my politics alike teach me that liberty is law, liberty is order, liberty is reason; "and always with right, reason dwells." But, on the other hand, neither will I consent in silence to allow a false impression to go forth to the world—that our country alone, of all countries, produces mobs without cause, and without provocation. I want both sides of this matter to be looked at. I go for the great Kentucky social organic principle—that as fights *must* happen in this world, in all such cases every man, no matter who, what, or on what side he be, shall have "fair play."

Indeed, I am free to say, that taking all the facts into consideration, the world in this age can hardly furnish a more striking proof of the power of the principle of law and order, under a Democracy, than is found in the fact that so much provocation has been borne so long and so patiently by our people—and especially, in the fact that for such a measure of disorder from such a cause, our statesmen felt free to utter such terms of manly and dignified rebuke in the Senate on Monday.

Sir, I rejoice in that utterance in the Senate. It was worthy the men and the place. It was well-timed, and admirable for what, I presume, was its chief purpose—to vindicate, in the eyes of foreign nations, our country from the imputation of inhospitality to a foreign public person. It is to be regretted that the precise character of that dignitary's visit, and his *status* politically towards our Government is not understood by the people. Had it been so the violence might not have occurred.

I have not sought to vindicate the mob, but to point out the true causes which instigated the mob. Those causes are, I think, obviously, in what I have shown of an effort, for years past persisted in by a certain class of journalists and ecclesiastics, to push Church power at all hazards,—on the one hand to brave the violence of public opinion, in their zeal to put down Protestant views of liberty and religion; on the other, to key up the tone of their own people, to stand by them firmly in the contest—that contest which they seek again to bring on between the doctrines of the Dark Ages and the doctrines of the Nineteenth Century.

I have shown you in detail the manner in which the first of these efforts—to excite the Non-Catholic people is made. I would now show you, in equally clear detail, that the other effort, to infuse a higher tone of bigotry into the minds of our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens, has also been made with zeal. To this point allow me to make a single quotation from a high authority.

"The higher, more consistent, and more practical tone of all journals

calling themselves Catholic in this country, has done much to remedy this evil. Catholic journalists can utter and are even expected to utter truths, the expression of which in their editorial columns ten years ago would have ruined their journals; still our best Catholic periodicals must be content still to do good by halves at the risk of not being permitted to do it at all, if their conductors do not know how to temper zeal with prudence. Many questions must be avoided which deserve and need to be discussed, and if all that is absolutely bad is excluded, much that is very true must be kept back. As no Catholic journalists would have dared ten years ago to condemn many popular theories now scouted by all Catholics deserving the name, so, no doubt, ten more years of progress will have weaned Christians here still further from the milk to which they are attached, and accustomed them to strong meat, which at present they will not suffer any one to present to them."—*Shepherd of the Valley*, October 22, 1853.

I make no remark on this singular announcement—I quote it as exhibiting the fact I have just stated—the effort to “key up” Roman Catholics who otherwise would live in peace as heretofore. Partially this effort is succeeding—but only partially.

They have succeeded better in stirring up the violence of the non-Catholic people than they perhaps desire just yet—for their success in the experiment on their own people has not kept pace with the other. It is at best a delicate and dangerous method of warfare, for if the feeling of bitterness on the one side grows faster than the bigotry of the other, the reaction will be tremendous. This double movement of theirs is not unlike the working of the *chain-shot* theory of our friend Colonel —, of Kentucky. When the news got to our little town, the Capital of the State, of the great battle of Buena Vista, in which we had two companies of young men—and of course felt intense interest—among the matters of news there was something that gave rise to a dispute, as to the character and use of chain-shot among the groups assembled in front of the printing office. The Colonel happening to pass by, was called in as a military man to settle the question of chain-shot, and being of that school of philosophers who have a reason ready and never confess to ignorance, “Chain-shot,” said he, “bless you, nothing more simple. You connect two balls by a chain, say one hundred feet long, then you plant your cannon in range at that distance apart, you ram one ball into this cannon, stretch the chain, and ram the other into the other. Then as you give word of command the two are touched off, then here it goes, you see the chain sweeping a whole regiment. It is simply a grand powder-saving arrangement, gentlemen.” “But,” said a young countryman who stood by absorbed in the description, “Colonel, what if one cannon didn’t go off?” “O true,” replied the Colonel, soberly, as if soliloquizing; “*that* I hadn’t thought of. Then the ball that went would swing round like a boat fast by



the stern, and play the mischief with our own men!" Much like that unfortunate result, sir, has been this new Romanist poliey, which to save powder and do two things at once, has been shooting at once its two guns, the one aimed to stir up the passions by scoffing at all they hold dear, the other to prepare their own people to stand up in a fight against them for the most outrageous pretences of ecclesiastical power.

I have gone somewhat at length into this branch of the resolution, because I deem it important to the success of the principle of "Freedom of Religion," to allow it to stand on its own merits, unembarrassed by excitements from other causes, with which the discussion of this question has no necessary connection. In the language of the resolution, we may consistently deprecate the violence on kindred subjects, while we urge this question on public attention. Come now, sir, to the allusion to "non-intervention" in the other clause of the resolution.

I have not space left, sir, for a separate discussion of the second clause of the resolution, containing the avowal of the doctrine of "non-intervention" and "no entangling allianees." This, however, is the less important, since the opposition to our views arises chiefly from a "confusion of ideas" on the part of such as oppose us, growing out of their failure, in the language of the next clause, "to accept as a practical reality the doctrine of the Bill of Rights" that "every man has a natural and inalienable right to worship God according to the dictates of conscience and reason," &c. I may therefore properly consider the two clauses in connection, in the few words which I have to offer on this point.

It is amazing, sir, to see these vague and indistinct notions current among our countrymen on this great question of rights of conscience. I speak now not merely of such, as with Archbishop Hughes, would unblushingly destroy that article of the Bill of Rights by interpolating a new definition of liberty of worship, as the right to worship God *in the way God has appointed*—leaving the Pope to declare what that way is. Neither do I refer to those who, following the same authority, would make liberty of conscience merely the "liberty to enjoy one's religious opinion undisturbed;"—as though mortal man had ever been silly enough to suppose that human power could reach the thoughts of man's inner soul, and prevent him from "enjoying his opinion." But I find many who, refusing to accept these definitions, yet seem afraid to accept in all its fullness the definition of our "Bill of Rights." They receive the declaration not as true of "*man*," but as true merely of *Americans*. Nay, not even of Americans generally, but of Americans *on our own soil*. For, if they do not formally state the proposition thus, there is yet, as Carlyle would say, an "inarticulate" notion to that effect lurking in their minds, which makes them start back from the doctrine of the Bill of Rights, when roundly asserted, as involving the hor-

rible consequences of "intervention" and of some sort of religious fillibusterism. And under pressure of that fear, and their horror of propagandism, they seem to limit, qualify, and trim down the rights of conscience in religion till the declaration of the Bill of Rights evaporates into the "mere ghost of a departed quantity." One is utterly at a loss to gather the conception of religious liberty which seems to float in the minds of many, who receive the Bill of Rights, and yet deny the right to utter any religious opinions which may be contrary to "police regulations"—who maintain the right, by courtesy of civilization, to visit foreign countries as American citizens, and yet deny the claim of courtesy to exercise the fundamental rights of American citizenship. Under such limits and restrictions, I can see nothing tangible enough even to conceive of. I am in the condition of one who asked a Western professor once, as they were ascending the Ohio, "Pray, sir, will you give me the fundamental idea of this Transcendentalism, of which I hear so much?" Pointing to one of those overhanging clay banks peculiar to the upper Ohio, bored full of holes by the innumerable swallows who burrowed there, the professor replied, "See you that bank full of holes, just ready to topple into the river? Well, now, just try to conceive in your mind the *abstract idea of a hole after the bank has washed away*—that is Transcendentalism." Not unlike that effort sir, to conceive the abstract idea of a hole in the bank, after the bank is washed away, is the effort to grasp the idea of freedom of religion and of worship after divesting it of all right of expression of opinion, of utterance in worship, of *acting* as well as *thinking* our religion. Liberty of opinion without liberty of expression is no liberty. I go farther, sir; I say that true religion, in its very nature, must have its outward expression in speech and action. "*Propagandism*" is its native impulse. The same grace of God that "creates a clean heart and renews a right spirit," impels the soul thus renewed "to teach transgressors His ways, that sinners may be converted to Him." Men seem to forget in this hue and cry against "*propagandism*," "religious *filibusterism*" and "*interference* with police regulations" that Christianity, whether in the individual soul, or in society at large, is by the necessity of its nature "*propagandism*." It seeks to expand itself—its history from its "beginning at Jerusalem" has been a history of movements for "*propagandism*" and "*annexation*."

But I design not to argue this question in its theological aspect. In so far as concerns the movement we are now making, it is purely a political question. In that aspect of it alone the resolution contemplates it, in asserting the obligation of our Government in the matter. We do not hold it to be the duty, or even the *right* of our Government to interfere, for the propagation any more than for the suppression of any form of religion. But it is the duty of our Government—committed as it is before the world to the

great principle of freedom of conscience—as a first principle of our politics, to cause that principle to be respected in the persons of our citizens wherever they go. As I understand it, there are certain rights pertaining to the citizens of every country, which are held by the writers on international law, to go with them in all countries, as “personal qualities.” Such, for instance, are those “personal qualities” involved in questions of citizenship, legitimacy, &c. minority, majority—so also marriage, divorce, bankruptcy. As to all these questions, the laws of his own country follow the citizen wherever he goes, and attach to him wherever resident. Now we hold that this right to worship God according to conscience, in like manner, should be recognized as an inherent “personal quality” of American citizenship in all the world. Just as anciently the punishment by scourging was held to be so utterly repugnant to the very conception of Roman freedom, that the orator, when he would inflame passion to the utmost against a public officer, need simply paint that officer as inflicting stripes upon one who cried “I am a Roman citizen,” or that an Apostle, when he would palsy with terror the tyrant magistrates, had only to say, “They have beaten us openly, being Romans.” So in all lands would we have it known and *felt*, that any constraint upon his religious worship is so utterly repugnant to the very idea of American citizenship, that to say, “I am an American citizen,” shall charm bigotry itself into courtesy and kindness.

If I may illustrate by the partial application of another analogy, this right should be claimed as due to the *sovereignty* of American citizens. “The person of a foreign sovereign,” says the Law of Nations, “going into the territory of another State is, by the general usage and comity of nations, exempt from the ordinary local jurisdiction.” As touching this one inherent and inalienable right, the American citizen, by birth-right a *sovereign*, may be allowed to demand something of the comity of nations; and this the more so since his title to sovereignty is established by the same ordinance, and stands upon precisely the same basis as his title to freedom of worship. If his Government may assert his claim to the one, why not to the other?

We are told, however, that the necessary consequence of such measures on the part of our government will be to bring us into conflict with other nations, who, unlike us, make religion a question of police regulations; and that, too, with the principles of International Law all against us. But you will observe the Resolution looks no further than to “peaceable measures” as the means—and then to two great points as the end. The first, *positive*—the assertion of this claim for our citizens. The second, negative, to wit: the refusal to recognize in any form, as a principle in the application of international law, the doctrine that religious worship is of right a matter to be controlled by civil government. As to the propriety of the means there can be no question. Let us consider then for a moment the jus-



tice and propriety of the ends proposed. Does our government violate any right, or give any just ground of offence to other nations, either by seeking the enjoyment of this right of freedom of worship for our citizens, or by refusing to recognize the opposite dogma as a part of the International Code? I am free to say, sir, that after some examination into the matter, I am unable to discover on what principle of international law other nations could ground a complaint against us. Whether you consult the abstractions of that law as laid down by the text writers, or the practical development of its principles in the history of modern diplomacy, you shall find nothing to prove that our government may not of right set up the claim for our citizens; yea, more than that, *interfere* in the way of remonstrating against the exercise of tyranny over the conscience in other nations, whenever such interference might be deemed expedient.

Turning first to the text writers—who seem not yet to have agreed even upon the true theory of the source and origin of the principles of international law—which ever of those theories we may adopt, the argument is equally cogent in favor of the right claimed in this resolution; for a government committed as ours is to the principles of the Bill of Rights.

For if with one class of writers we hold that international law derives its maxims from the law of nature applied to nations, then plainly the right to worship God according to conscience being held to be a natural and inalienable right, we cannot recognize, at the same time, any law as derived from the light of nature which may interfere with that natural right. On such a theory of international law, therefore, our government is restrained by its own organic principles from recognizing the authority of any law which violates the natural and inalienable rights of man.

If again we hold that this international law derives its maxims from the usage and consent of nations merely, then our country never having been a party to such consent touching the matter of religion as being under governmental control, is in so far under no obligation to recognize the principle, but on the contrary is precluded by our own fundamental law from being a party to such usage—and is therefore free to remonstrate against it. Nor can it be pretended that our country has tacitly consented to such a principle by recognizing in her diplomacy generally the commonly received law of nations—since as touching this one point, she is *incapable of giving such consent*, for such consent could be given only by administrative acts of her rulers; and under the organic law of the country, its rulers were prohibited from consenting to any such principle.

Or if we adopt the theory which seems to have been practically acted upon by modern nations, that defines international law, in the terms of a legal acquaintance of mine—as “the right of any nation to do any thing which other nations cannot restrain her from doing”—then the question is at an



end. For if "might is right," then in what cause shall might more justly exercise its authority than in favor of what it has proclaimed before the world, to be the natural and inalienable "rights of mankind."

And sir, it happens in this case, that even were such a theory acted upon by our Government in this matter—however the world at large might justly reproach us with violating the laws of natural justice, and with good reason—still those Governments of the world most likely to suffer from it, would be most effectually stopped from complaining, by the plea of their own high example. For herein they would but feel the practical application of principles which they themselves have established as International Law through 200 years of diplomacy. With what grace could Europe read us lectures on the iniquity of "intervention" in the face of the history of the wars of Charles V. to limit the power of Spain and Austria?—of the interferences of Austria and Spain for religion in France and Germany?—of the successive revolutions of Europe against the French Empire?—of the Holy Alliance of Russia, Austria, and Prussia, to superintend the interventional affairs of Europe? of the Congress of Verona in 1822 for the overthrow of the Spanish Cortes? In short, of every memorable piece of European diplomacy during the past century? But we are no advocates for such means. I cite those examples only to show, that even should the American government—as I trust it will not—make some high demands in that quarter in favor of more liberty and more conformity to American notions in the internal laws of other governments—even such demand would be no unheard of anomaly.

Allow me to say sir, that even in the past history of our country there have been occurrences which seem now to have passed out of the recollection of some of our fellow-citizens, who are so clamorous to keep down the utterance of American doctrines, in any tone loud enough to be heard across the Atlantic, as if in fear of disturbing the slumbers of despotism. It is no new thing for the United States to make either suggestions of amendments to the Constitution of nations, or of better behaviour to the nations themselves.—We have interpolated a section into the law of nations, declaring the slave-trade to be piracy. We hinted to the Sultan once that his conduct toward Greece was not in accordance with our notions of humanity. We ventured to say a word or two on behalf of South American Republics. Even to hold a Council with them at Panama. Not to mention various other instances, we have recently sent a friendly letter to Japan, expostulating with his Mightiness touching some odd and unreasonable notions of his, which we venture to hint are "behind the times"—and yet these Japanese notions are not much more so than a good many notions about religion now current in Europe, which a similar epistle might as likely modify. Nay, we have recently ventured to "interfere" in a modest way, not merely with "police regulations" but even "Court regulations" in Europe; and to intimate

quietly that their way of doing things in Court circles, not according with our views of the natural and inalienable right of every man to deck his own body, according to taste and reason, we must claim the right to do as we please in that regard. Surely, sir, I see nothing after all this, in the idea of our venturing a suggestion or two to other nations touching the matter of our religion and conscience!

Were it consistent with the proper limits of these remarks, sir, it would give me pleasure to present in some detail the reasons for pressing this matter just now. I shall detain you but a moment longer with a summary of them. In the first place our country now, for the first time in her history, is in a condition to consider in earnest the great question of her relation to other nations. Hitherto we have been absorbed with domestic questions relating to our internal growth and developement. These questions have been at last settled. The bank, the public lands, the tariff, internal improvements, and, finally we hope since the compromise acts, the question of slavery, are almost by-gone parties issues. And as we have begun to grow into importance among the nations, we are now ready for the discussion and settlement of the questions of our relation to other nations. The issues between our parties must now be for a time mainly issues on foreign policy. That question will most probably control, directly or indirectly, the next Presidential election. This then is just the time to present this great issue, and determine how far our influence shall be in favor of these great principles of religious freedom.

In the next place there are urgent reasons for pressing this matter now, arising out of the new relations of the nations of the world to each other. There is an obvious tendency in the present century, from the more intimate intercourse between the nations of Christendom and Pagan and Mohammedan nations, to extend what has been hitherto the international law of Christendom, to all nations alike. The rights of legation have been recognized during this century by Turkey, Persia, Egypt and the Barbary States, China, &c. and perhaps we may shortly add Japan. The inveterate anti-social, anti-commercial prejudices of ages are thrown aside, and the equality and independence of nations acknowledged by all. Nothing is more evident than that the system of international law, heretofore received in Christendom, must be speedily and essentially modified; a new and enlarged code, based upon more enlarged ideas, must obtain. In such a state of affairs, our country, now so great as to command their respect, should surely not be backward to press our principles upon the attention of all nations; and the more so, since these principles alone offer the only sure basis for a law which shall command the obedience of all nations and all religions alike.

And allow me to add in conclusion, sir, that we have every motive for desiring the general recognition of our American doctrine of religious free-

dom that can arise from the desire of self-preservation. From our position and character as the general asylum of humanity, we are ever importing from the countries from which we would obtain this recognition, opinions utterly subversive of our principles. So long as we have railroads to build, this influence must constantly increase; for after all, it is American railroads that, in large part, both build the churches, and furnish the congregations, whose religious ideas have no affinity for the principle of liberty of worship. This influence re-acts upon elements native to our soil, to increase their hostility, as their power increases, to that doctrine of the Bill of Rights. Nothing can be more visionary than the very current idea that here we are to have a milder and modified form of Romanism. The idea is in the face of our great national characteristic. Jonathan does nothing by halves. He will out Herod Herod. "You have no such volcano as that in your country—no Vesuvius!" "No," replied Jonathan, "but we have a Niagara that'll put her fires out in five minutes!" That is the spirit of our people in all things. We will not be surpassed in good or evil. Already the journals at Rome are amazed at the American doctrines of the Pope's supremacy. And with such elements of hostility to our great principles busily at work amongst us, as I have shown in the earlier portions of these remarks, with unbounded freedom to work evil; and more than all, with the constant tendency of the American mind, as all other mind, to lose its hold on *great ideas*, even whilst still holding fast to the words which express them, every reflecting man must perceive the necessity of a constant pressing of these great principles, both at home and abroad, if we desire them to retain their hold on the popular mind. For however our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens may at present hold, with all the ardor of patriotism, to the Bill of Rights—and I doubt not many of them are just as patriotic as the best of us—yet it is not in reason to suppose that they, or any other portion of our people, can long be subjected to the influence of the journalism and the ecclesiasticism I have been describing, constantly growing in power as that influence is, by the immigration of despotic principles, without danger of impairing the force of the American doctrines of religious liberty over their minds.

---

#### Speech of Hiram Ketchum, Esq.

Mr. Ketchum next addressed the meeting, and spoke as follows:—

I am sure, fellow-citizens, that you have been very much interested, as I have been, in listening to the remarks of the learned and reverend gentleman who has done us the favor to visit and address us on this occasion. But if I may be permitted for a single moment to express a dissent from a part of those remarks, it seems to me a matter that may be set more clearly

before the audience. I understood my learned friend to say that the country required some vindication for its treatment of Monsignor Bedini. Now, I desire to state that, in my judgment of the case, Monsignor Bedini has not been ill-treated in this country because he was a Roman Catholic Archbishop. No man, of any religion, will be ill-treated by the Government, or people, because of his religious opinions; but it has been said in defence, I hope untruly, I know nothing on that subject, that this reverend gentleman, Monsignor Bedini, had been guilty of great inhumanity in his own country; and for that, and no other reason, the people of this country, or some of them, thought he was not entitled to our respect. I do not know that any of his legal rights have been invaded; but if the people of this country believe him guilty of inhumanity, who can prevent them, who ought to prevent them from signifying their displeasure, provided no law is violated. The reverend gentleman (Mr. Robinson) will excuse me if I have thought it necessary to say that no man at home or abroad can say that Monsignor Bedini, or any other man, has been ill-treated by any person or people because of his religious opinions; for had he been a Protestant he would have been treated precisely in the same manner if he had come here charged with the same brutal inhumanity.

And now, my fellow citizens, I will proceed to adduce my opinions in relation to this matter. It seems to me that the subject upon which we have met to deliberate to-night is one of immeasurable importance. It is not in my power to exaggerate that importance, and yet it seems to me that I speak of it with respect, when I say that in all questions relating to negotiations between this country and foreign Governments, in the present state of the public mind in this country, and the present state of the world, we are to speak upon the subject with great caution. I entirely concur in the spirit, and for the most part, in the language of the resolutions which have been offered here to-night, and especially in that part of the 11th resolution to which I will now refer. "That this meeting is fully aware that in the prosecution of this important work, the greatest prudence will be requisite. It advocates the use of no means but those of reasonable argument and kind persuasion." There is nothing, my fellow citizens, more natural than for us Americans to think that ours are the best principles for the government of man and the promotion of human happiness; and there is nothing more natural than for us to desire that those principles should be established by every Government for every people; and I may add that there is nothing more natural than for some people to desire that these principles should be established by force against all force, and against every kind of principles that may oppose them. We, as Americans, are bound to protest against this. General Washington, in his farewell address to his countrymen, has these remarks:



“Harmony and a liberal intercourse with all nations are recommended by the policy of humanity and interest, and even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand, neither seeking nor granting exclusion or preferences, consulting the natural course of things, diffusing and diversifying, by gentle means, the streams of commerce, *but forcing nothing.*”

The very basis and foundation of persecution is the principal of “I am right; you are not. I am certainly right; you are certainly wrong; and now for your own good I have a right to compel you to be right.” There can be no individual or national objection to the right way; and let us press our cause with kind persuasion and argument, and that is all we need do.

In the first place, we desire that Americans going abroad to foreign nations shall be allowed their own mode of worship—that they shall be allowed their own convictions of duty in respect to religious matters. Well, now, gentlemen, what is the argument? The argument is this: You are permitted the same in our country. We do not ask you to make a treaty that we shall grant the same privileges to your people, because that needs no stipulations. We have proclaimed our principles to the world. We are for religious liberty. We have proclaimed that idea as a part of the very foundations of our Government. There is, therefore, no necessity for us to stipulate these privileges; we can do nothing less than guard this privilege; and we are willing to grant it to the people of all nations in common with us. But we have a right to ask that you will grant these privileges to Americans traveling among you. We do not mean to say that you have no right to govern your own people in your own way, and as you choose; that belongs, by right, to every independent State; but we put the question to you—is it not right, is it not proper, that inasmuch as you have privileges among us, of this high and important character, that you shall extend to our citizens the same. Gentlemen, it seems to me that this is very reasonable. It seems to me that without entering into any entangling alliances, without making any improper concessions, without going beyond anything that is proper and safe for our Government, that we can ask these privileges for our people; and I have no doubt, that if they are asked for, they will be granted, first by one nation, and then by another, and they will find it to be for their interest in doing it; and, if it is properly urged, with kind persuasion, they will feel its necessity and importance.

Well, then, gentlemen, we go further. We desire the influence of our Government to be exercised in favor of religious liberty all over the world, not only for our own citizens, but for the citizens of every country. Well, now, what is our argument upon this subject? Why are not these privileges granted in foreign countries? Why is all of this persecution carried on? There is a reason, and it is this: Religion, they say, is the necessary, conservative principle of State. Men will not restrain their passions; they

will not be governed by principles which are necessary to good citizenship, without religion. That is true. We accede to that. Religion is a great conservative principle of the State. Without religion there can be no liberty. Religion is the great handmaid of American liberty, and it is the conservative principle that is absolutely essential to the preservation of that liberty. There we agree: but then they say that we can never have this religion unless we establish it by law. The first proposition is, that religion is necessary; and the second is, that it must be established by law. Well, now, we reply, that in this last idea you are mistaken. We have tried it. We know from our own experience, that religion can be maintained and preserved without its being established by law. We kindly urge upon you the lessons of our experience. We ask you, for the benefit of mankind, that you will try the experiment as we have done, and see if religion cannot be maintained without the support of the civil arm. We have tried it. We know that He who has enjoined this religion can protect and take care of it, and that He will take care of it. We know that He requires not the sustaining power of the civil arm to support His own religion. We say to you that we have tried this, that we know it, and we press it home upon you as a fact which your experience will demonstrate to be true. But if you come to the conclusion that religion must be established by law—that the majority of the people must have their religion established by legal enactments—then, we ask, for the benefit of humanity, that you will not visit with the penalty those who do not conform to it; that if there is a minority in the State who cannot conscientiously conform to your established religion, we ask you to let them alone, and let them enjoy the convictions of their own consciences, and worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences. They answer that this will never do. If we do not punish non-conformity, we shall lose all the members of the established church. We say, in reply, gentlemen, you are mistaken; for if you punish a man for his religious opinions, so far from these opinions diminishing, they will increase. We know it; we have tried it. Such has been our experience, and we ask you to consider this matter. We ask you not to allow the penalties of the law to light upon men because of their religious opinions. Mark—we ask nothing for men who have no religion. The reason why we ask in favor of the man who has religious opinions, is this: He considers himself bound first to his God, and then to his country, and he could not conscientiously disobey his God, though his country might demand it; but if he believes that there is no God, we ask no favor for him. Let him have the protection of the American citizen wherever he goes; but we ask no favors for his conscience, for he has none. We plead in behalf of the men who come under the obligation that they may serve God first and their country next. We pray you to protect and respect such men; for in our experience in our own country, and in all antecedent history, these are the best men for the country and for the world.

My friends, in my judgment we have no right to go farther. If they do not see the force of our reasoning, we must stop, and not think of the sword or of force, for we have no right to use it. There may be men coming from foreign countries preaching to us that we do not know the doctrines of our Washington—that we have never understood them; but, my friends, they will go out of the country with disgrace. We do understand that our doctrine is non-intervention by force; we will persuade, we will argue, we will invite men to follow our example, but there we stop. The arm of this Government is never to be invoked to promulgate by force our principles, however wise and however good we know them to be. No, my friends, it is not for me to say that these opinions are popular or unpopular, but in my judgment they are right and in accordance with my convictions of duty. And yet here is an ample field, accorded by the spirit of these resolutions, for us to press our argument, to press our persuasion.

Gentlemen, I am sorry to detain you a single moment, because there is a great treat in reserve for you; but there is one other idea that I desire to comment upon this evening. I think it may be inferred from some remarks made by other gentlemen, that we are bound to protect Christian missionaries in foreign lands. To a certain extent—to an extent that is stated in these resolutions, (for they are drawn up with great care,) I accede; that is, that we are bound to protect our missionaries, and to see that they are not punished contrary to the law of the country where they are. But, gentlemen, there is a sense, there is a degree in which this Government cannot protect Christian missionaries. It has been said here to-night, and no sentiment has come to my heart more warmly, that Christianity is aggressive. It is aggressive. It is not content with staying at home. It comes from Him who spake to its first teachers, "Go and teach all nations to receive my Gospel." Go, and if necessary, arraign Governments, and kings, and others. Under their commission our Missionaries must arraign them; but in doing so they do just what the first teachers of Christianity did, they take their lives in their own hands. They ask no protection but from Him who gave them their commission, and if it is necessary that their lives should be sacrificed in order to inculcate and promulgate the truth, their lives are just as cheap as those of the Apostles. They are willing to sacrifice their lives; they ought to be willing to sacrifice them; and you and I, and all of us who are Christian parents, should be willing to send forth our sons, and should be proud of the privilege, to be sacrificed, if needful. In all this they ask no protection from the Government. It may be necessary for them to arraign the laws, and therefore they cannot be protected. It may be necessary to arraign those in authority; and in such case they can hardly be protected by those in authority. Therefore, in my judgment, there is a sense in which it would be unwise, inexpedient, and unjust to call upon this Government to protect Christian missionaries; and yet in the sense in which it is clearly declared in

this resolution to protect them, when they do not violate the laws of the country, we have a right to do so.

---

Speech of the Rev. Edward N. Kirk.

Mr. Kirk has written out his remarks from memory and brief notes. They are, of course, somewhat varied from the Speech as delivered, but express substantially the same views.

One word more about Bedini. I know from their own testimony that there is in the heart of the people in Roman Catholic countries a deep detestation of their civil and ecclesiastical oppressors. They may remain faithful to their religion; but they have learned to distinguish between two objects which their teachers are always confounding, the Church and the Hierarchy.

Taking Mr. Ketchum's opinion to be correct, that in the recent insult to the Pope's Nuncio there has been no violation of law, it is entirely in accordance with the objects of this meeting, not to vindicate violence, or any insult to the representative of a foreign power, if such he were; but to state the case in its true light. If Mr. Bedini came here as an Ambassador to our Government, or as a Commissioner charged with some particular business, then his person is sacred in the eyes of our people. But, to preserve its sanctity he must really be an Ambassador to our Government; and he must strictly confine himself to the business and sphere of an Ambassador. But if he steps out of that sphere, and attempts to meddle in local questions between the people and their oppressors; if, especially, he lends himself to that un-American and most dangerous project of forcing and coaxing the people to resign all Church property into the hands of the Bishops, then he throws away the Ambassador's shield, and stands among us, simply as a private citizen or traveler. Now, when we remember that the persons who led in these demonstrations of disrespect, are foreigners; that they have once been trodden to the earth by the iron heel of despotism; that they have now breathed the air of freedom, it is not surprising that the presence of a man who comes to represent that very despotism here, should make their blood boil somewhat above its ordinary level. Mr. Bedini has received no insult as a Roman Catholic, but as the representative of hierarchical despotism; the people have said, we want none of your "kith or kin."

Imagine a nest of pirates to have taken possession of an island in the Pacific ocean, at which our whaling and merchant-ships must frequently touch. They attack, rob and murder, as it suits their purpose. Could there be any question whether our Government should negotiate with them by means of an armed force? Take then a real case of another kind—the King



of Japan chooses to shut his people out from the family of nations, and even to treat seamen wrecked upon his shores with cruelty. Here is another occasion of negotiation, at least, semi-belligerent. And the civilized world applauds the measure. But there is another case. Business and recreation are continually taking the citizens of this Republic to countries governed by Roman Catholic Princes. They are not indeed robbed nor murdered by these governments. But they are deprived of rights more dear to us than those of property; the rights of conscience. We are forbidden to erect houses for the worship of God, unless we believe as the Government believes. Thus we are virtually punished as heretics, and we are embarrassed and insulted in the burial of our dead. Our trunks are searched, our conversations with the natives are reported; and we may be imprisoned solely for the crime of talking with a Roman Catholic, or lending him a book expressing our belief.

On this footing we have thus far stood with the Mussulman and the Catholic princes. What then is to be done? An immediate termination must be put to the exciting compromise with their barbarous notions and customs. The only question is, by what means?

One course is this. We may adopt a system of non-intercourse; and thus express to these governments our views of them as too barbarous for civilized nations to meet them on a friendly and equal footing. We may say to these persons—"Your policy is not only unchristian, it is brutal. What right has the God of Heaven ever given to a civil government to inflict civil penalties and disabilities for religious opinions?" If they reply, "it is a necessary police-regulation," we answer "that is just the feature of it we detest; that you tell us you cannot sustain your Government or your Church, without insulting and doing violence to other people. Then you have adopted the policy and the logic of Nero and Dioclesian, of Japan and Madagascar; and we, as a civilized and Christian people, can have no further intercourse with you until you yourselves come within the pale of Christian civilization." When we see the cruelties that are practised upon our citizens in Cuba, "insulted and pillaged at the graves of their departed, and that, in the name of Christ's religion; when we see the outraged consciences of the natives of Italy and Austria, hunted, seized, condemned, imprisoned and exiled for not thinking as their rulers think,—we are forced to exclaim to the Governor of Cuba, to the Duke of Tuscany, and the Emperor of Austria, and all the united and robed priesthood behind them, 'you barbarians, you cannibals, we can have nothing to do with you, but to defend ourselves from your ferocity.'" This language undoubtedly must seem to them the climax of extravagance and impudence; but in our soberest judgment, it is precisely the treatment that all forms of religious persecution merit from men who have read the life and precepts of Christ.

But while this course of excommunication would be entirely just toward these princes and prelates, it would be great injustice toward the people they govern, who, generally have no share in these sentiments of their leaders.

A second course then would be, to measure brute force with brute force, and reciprocate their treatment of our citizens. If Tuscany and Austria are right in setting Romanism against Protestantism, as a political system, then it will be right in all Protestants to do the same. And we may therefore begin the work at once here in New-York. We are twenty three million American Protestants. And you say, you have three million Catholics. Now we twenty three million are very much afraid of the contaminating influence of your doctrines and worship. You have always opposed free institutions, and degraded every nation you have governed; we therefore make a "police regulation" that prohibits you from building or owning a house of worship, performing the rites of burial, or using the press to propagate your views; and if you do not regard our prohibition, we twenty three million, will put you three million in prison, or send you to Liberia or kill you. That could be done. But it is not Protestant or Christian, however pleasing the policy may be to the Holy Apostolical Roman Church.

Then there remains the course proposed by this meeting, that of peaceful and courteous, but firm negotiation. We must insist on it as a condition of our respect, and of our maintaining friendly relations with foreign governments, that they put away the policy of persecution, or religious intolerance. It may be said that our Government expressly disavows any interference with religious matters; it was not organized for religious purposes. We reply: that the general government of these United States has not a more legitimate employment of its diplomatic and treaty-making power, than this. It was organized, neither for religion nor commerce; but for the citizens; for the highest good of Christian men. It is a Christian government; a Protestant government. It simply, and most wisely does not pretend to choose any man's religious opinions and connexions for him. To do all that it can do in the defence of rights, is one great design of government; of all rights, the inferior and the superior. We do not ask it to erect colleges, nor to cultivate model farms, nor to plant cotton, or build ships, to erect churches or employ preachers. We simply ask its arm of power to defend us against all unjust impediment or hindrance in our pursuits in each of these departments. We claim its protection at home and abroad; for the mechanic and the scholar, the landsman and the mariner, the merchant and the missionary, the traveler and the foreign resident; for the Roman Catholic and the Jew, the Infidel, the Mormon, or the Presbyterian; against pirates, princes and priests, or whomsoever, that molest them in the exercise of their inalienable rights. There was a time when the humblest man stand-

ing before purple-robed tyranny, and uttering the magic words; "I am a Roman citizen," could make the tyrant tremble on his throne. The time is now come, when the declaration; "I am an American citizen," should be a shield against the tyranny of every land. It may be farther urged, as an objection, that this course is an intermeddling with the domestic policy of other States. But as that would lie against the majority of our negotiations, it is not worthy of consideration. If the domestic policy of Great Britain leads her to "impress" our seamen into her service, we must and will intermeddle with it. Or, if she injures our rights as fishermen, we will persistently negotiate until that "domestic policy" is abandoned. But surely our religious rights are as worthy of negotiation as codfish and haddock.

Negotiations by Ambassadors is precisely the remedy open to us. We send abroad men conversant with our institutions, laws, customs and sentiments; men zealous for our welfare and the nation's honor; at the same time, gentlemen conversant with the rights of other nations, with international law, and all the proprieties of the most refined society. They stand on a footing of equality with sovereigns, as they represent a nation's sovereignty. They have ample opportunities for calm and free discussion, apart from all popular excitement, or impertinent interference. To such men we are willing to entrust this great interest. And therefore we hope our Executive will always send men of a true spirit; not sycophants and flatterers, not admirers of regal pomp and aristocratic exclusiveness. One such Ambassador as Charles J. McCurdy, (although he had but a part of an Ambassador's power or privilege,) can do more to advance the true interests of our countrymen, to command respect to our political principles and our personal rights, than any compromising, half-royalist, half-Church-and-State diplomatist, whatever his ability may be. I cite him only as one of many men who deserve well of their country, for maintaining the rights of a citizen against "the domestic policy" of an arbitrary government, and I cite his example, in the case of Charles Brace, as evidence that we advocate a feasible measure.

Being in Florence at the time of Miss Cunningham's imprisonment, I heard an English lady exclaim, "I wish she were an American." I immediately inquired why she expressed such a wish, "Oh," she replied, "Your Ambassador would demand her liberation." In fact, that is the common belief through Europe, that the protection of the American Government over its citizens is a reality, and nothing has secured for us profounder respect. Though, I admit, we are losing some honor by our strange tardiness in the case of the Rev. Jonas King.

But if any question this, as the opinion of a clergyman on a point of statesmanship, I will refer them to the admirable letter of John Quincy Adams to Mr. Anderson, in reference to the treaty about to be made in 1823 with the Colombian Government. It is too long to be quoted here, even

that portion in which he expatiates on the point of religious freedom. But it was worthy of the man, and probably conduced greatly to the prosperity which now distinguishes that Republic from others around it, by inducing it to adopt a liberal and enlightened policy.

I would say no more on this occasion, in reference to the defence of our own rights. But I take still higher ground, and maintain that the Government of the United States should use its influence with foreign governments, to put an end to all restraint of religious freedom by civil authority.

Instead of speeches, the worthy Secretaries might have occupied this entire evening with an exhibition of instances of religious persecution in Roman Catholic countries, that would produce emotions of the deepest disgust. Few travellers trouble themselves to see them. But they can be seen by those who choose to mingle with the people. An ingenious writer has said that the Americans judge everything by their own notions. But I should wish to ask him, what other people do differently; or, by what other standard we must judge, than that which we have adopted as the real standard? And we must regard the whole system of coercing and resisting personal religious convictions as a monstrous violation of the natural rights of mankind. They inquire—what is religious freedom? we reply, it is not the right of believing what any corporation, civil or ecclesiastical, dictates to you as the Word of God; but the right to hear Him, just as they hear Him. It is not the right to believe that the self-styled Holy Apostolic Roman Church has all the truth and piety in the world. It is the right of answering, not to man, but to God alone, for your opinions and worship. It is the right of an infidel, or a heretic, to enjoy all the privileges of citizenship, unmolested by anything but the moral disapprobation of his fellow citizens. We believe the whole system of coercing the conscience to be as absurd as it is wicked. Do the damp walls of a dungeon convince a man that a priest can make God out of a wafer; and so that as many thousand Gods are existing as there are priests saying mass at the same moment? If you find a man, does that make him believe the Council of Trent to have been anything better than a shameful political cabal? Did the Duke of Tuscany convert the Medici by persecution? Nay, did he limit the spread of Protestant views by it? He has only given the more public announcement of their principles, and awakened a sympathy which predisposes men to believe their doctrines. Intelligent men throughout Europe become infidels by observing the violence done to the conscience, through the influence of the priest. The very existence of these laws and regulations is a justification of all other persecutions. And if the mobs in our cities had put Bedini in prison, they would only have done what high authorities have sanctioned in the cases of the Medici, Guicciardini, Miss Cunningham, and thousands of others. Some of the best people in the world are now meeting in Florence, in secret, to worship God,



as if they were a band of murderers. Even Martini's translation of the Bible, sanctioned by Roman Catholic authority, cannot be printed without notes. The policy of Tuscany, is, in fact, retreating rapidly toward the barbarism of the dark ages. In 1786 Leopold undertook to reform the Church. Among other improvements he modified a very severe law against professors or preachers, who should say anything derogatory to the Catholic religion. By an exquisite process of torturing, that law was made to condemn the Madiari. But its distortion was so manifest, that they have now made another exactly suited to such cases.

These Governments are warding off an evil day, but preparing a concentration of its evils whenever it shall come. It must come; and when it comes there will be no more mercy for priest or prince. The outraged conscience is now smothering its wrath and waiting its day.

But may our Government interfere in this matter? Without a doubt; not by force, but by persuasion; not by arms, but by negotiation. This is not only a right possessed by us, but an obligation imposed upon us. Assuming that our doctrine is true, and the opposite is false, we present both precedents and principles, to maintain the position that our government may and must assume this work. The message of Mr. Monroe, so beautifully commended by Mr. Webster, is a specimen of the manner in which our Government has spoken its sentiments to the crowned heads of Europe in favor of civil freedom. The allied sovereigns were turning their attention to the young Republics of Mexico, Central America, and South America. Mr. Monroe warned them not to stretch their tyrannical arms across the sea, unless they were prepared to sweep away the United States with the other free governments. Mr. Webster says; "It met with the entire concurrence and the hearty approbation of the country. The people saw, and they rejoiced to see, that, on a fit occasion, our weight has been thrown into the right scale, and that, without departing from our duty, we had done something useful, and something effectual, for the cause of civil liberty. One general glow of exultation, one universal feeling of the gratified love of liberty, pervaded all bosoms." Mr. Brougham, he said, declared in the House of Commons, "that no event had ever created greater joy, exultation, and gratitude, among all the free in Europe." The same great statesman remarked in his speech on the Revolution in Greece, before the House of Representatives in 1824, "the time has been when fleets and armies, and subsidies, were the principal reliance even in the best cause. But happily for mankind, a great change has taken place in this respect. Moral causes come into consideration in proportion as the progress of knowledge is advanced." "The allied powers have expressed their opinions, and do not call that expression an interference. For the same reason, any expression which we may make of different principles and different sympathies, is no interference."

These two cases of a declaration of sentiment in the messages of our President, defended by one whose political opinions are, with us, almost oracular, may suffice in the way of precedent. We have, moreover, a right of self-defence in the case; for these tyrannical principles and practices are actually a great hindrance to the free intercourse of civilized nations. And Europe herself will find, that until she shall abolish them, her social system will never be settled again on a tranquil basis. New relations must be established between the altar and the throne before the peace of Europe will be secure; the balance of power will require a new adjustment of these two great sources of power.

But America has a position and a work which even our own people seem but partially to apprehend. There is among us a party who may be named, from their favorite doctrine, the party of Manifest-Destiny.

And are we assembled to-night to echo their sentiments? By no means. Some of them are insincere; for they believe only in Will, not at all in Destiny, Providence or Predestination. Others mean by it; the right to steal their neighbor's land, by virtue of a decree of the Deity, which has been made in their behalf as favorites of heaven, and specially revealed to them.

We accept their terms, and reject their definitions.

Sir, we have a manifest destiny; but it is the destiny to a privilege which we seem not to have understood as a people. Oh that the spirit of Divine Wisdom may enable our countrymen, native and adopted, to conceive its grandeur, to coincide with its beloved aims, and enter upon the accomplishment of the work it assigns us!

I say destiny, because I believe there are two kinds of destiny; one, to a probation of glorious opportunity, which leaves the will free, and with ample scope and every motive to the noblest power of action; the other, to a doom where our will is not consulted nor regarded. The former is the present destiny of this country. I say manifest, for it is patent to some who have read the decree; and may be to all who choose to read it, where it lies, written on every page of our wonderful history.

What then is the original and peculiar work of this Republic? Not commerce: that it shares with others, and is but following a noble lead, even if its tonnage should outnumber theirs. It is not annexation of territory: that is as old as the Nimrods and Alexanders of history.

It is not boasting of our greatness, nor a strife for national glory. We are born too late to be inventors there.

It is not blustering and defying our neighbors. That is too old fashioned for Young America.

It is not confidence in brute force, or the genius of war. That field of originality is exhausted already.

No; the decree we have read, says, the day is past for a new people to

devote themselves to so small and exclusive and selfish an object of national glory. God and man are weary of the bloody farce. He who seeks only to make America rival other nations in wealth, military and naval power, has not seized the true idea of our destiny. We descend from the lofty pedestal where God's own hand has placed us, when in order to determine our greatness, we commence measuring the degree of brute force we have; the number of our square-miles, or the rate of our Steam-ships and yachts. We descend still lower, when we ape the corrupter forms of European civilization, and the barbarian luxury of a mushroom aristocracy, to inoculate this model city of the model republic. It is not our talents, our refinements, our high civilization, that have attracted to us the kind regards and the profound respect of the best men in Europe.

They saw our destiny and thought we saw it. They revered the founders of the Republic, Washington and the old school statesmen, who indulged in no bravado or boastings; who always said to other nations, as we do in social life, respect our rights, and we will respect yours. And they looked on us as on a younger son, who, awakened the hope, by his noble qualities, that he was going to retrieve the lost fortunes of the family. There are now among us some of the noblest spirits that Europe has nurtured. They came here to join us, because they saw that this was the territory where humanity could take on its new phase of fraternity. Here the gospel is unfettered in its action. Here is a national civil freedom, founded on the moral government of God, and the gospel of Jesus Christ. The material and social results of which we boast, are but the fruits of these principles. And the moment we begin to boast of the fruits, we have begun to renounce the principles from which they spring.

We are called to labor for Humanity; for the Race. Patriotism must here receive a new definition, our *E Pluribus Unum* must take on a broader signification. Our "annexation" must change its nature, and enlarge its projects; taking into the national heart the human race. Whatever we may do in Science, in our social and political life let us hear nothing more of Anglo-Saxon,—substituting for it, Human. The field of our work is not America alone, but the world. We are not American, but cosmopolitan. Whatever the savans may decide, let the American creed be "the unity of the human race."

Our destiny then, I repeat, is to hold and to manifest certain great principles, old as creation; new as our republic.

Nothing so fundamentally distinguishes us from the other prominent nations of the world, as the thorough adoption of the principle of man's personality. It was lost in the apostacy, because the balance principle of submission to divine authority was then destroyed. And, to make society possible, the poor substitute of human authority had to be adopted. And what a history it has made for our apostate race! Man, absorbed in the State or

in the Church! Only once, in the long period of four thousand years, did he spring up and breathe the air of personal freedom; in the brief and brilliant period of the Greek democracy.

When Christ came, he laid it at the basis of all his teachings, and interwove it with His Gospel. He drew men apart from the evil government, apart from the established Church; apart from society, schools, sects, parties, families, to deal with them as men. Their duty is personal, and directly to God, with no human medium. They are to call no man father. Their responsibility is to God alone. When this high matter is determined, then the individual man comes back to his country, his church, his family, a freeman, under law to Christ; a law to himself. Society wants no criminal law to defend its interests against him. He has all the law she wants; the law of love in his heart. Human authority cheeking his outward actions is not the case for this freeman of heaven. God's authority makes him do right toward all men.

This was the doctrine of the Son of God. He gave out the lost idea that man was every thing; and governments, states, churches, priests and pastors, but instruments used for the good of the individual man.

Out of this root of personality has grown religious liberty, and civil liberty. They are but the logical corollaries of the doctrines of personality and personal responsibility. Christ, as a religious teacher and reformer, had neither name, nor badge, nor title, nor commission from Caiaphas or Cæsar. He treated every hearer as a freeman; and taught that the sincerity of worship depends upon personal conviction and the freedom of choice.

That, Sir, is the great, the glorious truth committed to this people: the European idea, on the contrary, is that of authority. European society, and European Christianity is in the swaddling bands of infancy, and the go-cart of childhood.

America's work is, to maintain at home, and spread abroad, Christ's, principle—that man is accountable to God in matters of religion; not to man.

At the close of Mr. Kirk's speech, the Resolutions, which Prof. Crosby had submitted, were unanimously adopted.

The Rev. Dr. Fairchild then presented a resolution which was adopted, "That copies of the Proceedings of the Meeting, together with the Statement read at the opening, be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The meeting then adjourned *without day*.

Thus terminated one of the most important meetings ever held in the city of New York. We cannot but hope that (with God's blessing) it will do much good. It is highly important that similar ones be held at all the influential points in our country.